This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANNEX

Digitized by Google

Contents.

1. Remarks on Mosaic Cosmogony.

2. A Letter to the Minister of Silver St Chapel Taunton re The Pre-millennial Advent of the Lord.

3. On the Natural Relations of Men & Government to God

4. Zechariah V.

5. Duty of Giving Heed to the Predictions of Scripture re Events that are to precede the Return of the Lo

6. Genesis II. 5.

7. Theological Opinions of Rev Joseph Cook.

8. Remarks — re Natural Law the Spiritual World

Google

Digitized by Google

REMARKS

ON

"Mosaic Cosmogony,"

BEING

THE FIFTH OF THE "ESSAYS AND REVIEWS."

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

Third Edition, Revised.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE - CLERKENWELL 6404.

1882.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
345271A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1927 L

LONDON
WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO., PRINTERS
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

Digitized by Google

Advertisement.

THE first edition of these "Remarks" was published several years ago, soon after the issue of "Essays and Reviews," written by members of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

The present edition has been revised, and slight additions have been made.

The subject is one of the deepest moment. How can the fear of God dwell in our hearts, if we acquiesce, even tacitly, in statements that nullify, or undermine, the authority of Holy Scripture? How can we be on the Lord's side, if we do not uncompromisingly maintain the authority and the absolute truthfulness *in all things*, of God's Word Written?

LONDON, May, 1882.

27X467

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Remarks on "Mosaic Cosmogony," being the fifth of the "Essays and Reviews."

MAGNA EST VERITAS ET PRÆVALEBIT—familiar and oft-repeated words, embody a sentiment that is in itself unquestionably true, for it is founded on the sure promise of God's Holy Word. Truth *is* mighty, and will *finally* prevail. But we must not forget that God has His own appointed seasons for the fulfilment of His promises. We certainly know from Holy Scripture that in the *present* Dispensation, Truth will *not* prevail. We are distinctly taught that in this Dispensation "evil men and seducers will wax worse and worse" (2 Tim. iii. 13); "that in the last days perilous times shall come" (2 Tim. iii. 1); that "there shall come in the last days scoffers," &c. (2 Pet. iii. 3.) The Old and the New Testaments alike declare that the very moment when the reign of Evil shall be suddenly cut off for ever, will be one in which it will have attained a greatness and a development never before equalled. The persons and systems that have hitherto been marked as peculiar embodiments of evil, are but foreshadowings and warnings of THE Antichrist and THE Antichristianism that

Digitized by Google

are about to be. If we did not know what the Scripture has revealed respecting the progress of evil, we might well be dismayed at the signs of the present time. Pure Christian Truth has made but little progress: Israel remains outcast and blinded; throughout the earth generally, falsehood, violence and bloodshed reign: and even in our own favoured land where the national recognition of the Bible has, for centuries, brought with it such marked results of blessing, that holy Book has of late received, (and that from unexpected quarters) a series of assaults, before which the mere educational faith of many is beginning to quiver and fall. Every day seems to augment the number and boldness of the enemies of Revealed Truth. The guarded suggestiveness which first characterized the writings of philosophic sceptics in England, is now giving place to more undisguised utterances of impiety. In all this, however, we do but see another indication of that coming darkness which we are taught in Scripture to expect as the immediate precursor of the long-hoped for morning—that "morning without clouds," when Truth shall at last spring out of the earth, and righteousness look down satisfied from heaven. Would that these "adversaries" (for so they are termed in Scripture, Heb. x.) would remember that by their very scoffings and triumphs they are but fulfilling the predictions of the Word of God, and affording another proof of its prescience and truthfulness. The Scripture has abundantly spoken of the

Digitized by Google

infidelity that is to prevail in the latter days—it has delineated its course—it has declared its final doom. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God."

Infidelity has ever been accustomed to attack the New Testament through the Old. The consciences of men, unless altogether hardened, cannot but recognise that there is in the New Testament something superhuman and heavenly and blessed, in the character, and ways, and teaching, of the Saviour of sinners. They know that never man spake as He. Infidels, therefore, for the most part deem it unwise to commence their assault on Truth by directly assailing the New Testament, and the personal teaching of the Lord. The writings of Moses are deemed a more hopeful subject of attack. Men pretend that the truthfulness of the writings of Moses may be impugned without the authority of the Lord Jesus being thereby affected. But do they really believe this? Is it possible for any man of ordinary reflectiveness to take the New Testament in his hand and to say, that it does not, over and over again, affirm the divine authority of Moses? The Lord Jesus, whilst publicly declaring Himself to be the appointed Witness of Truth in the earth, and working miracles in attestation of that claim early took occasion to attest the mission of Moses by saying, that He Himself came to fulfil that Law which Moses had ministered. "Verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass" (observe the

Digitized by Google

solemnity of His words) "not one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled." Again, He said, "THE SCRIPTURE cannot be broken:" and under that term—THE SCRIPTURE, every one that heard Him knew that the writings of Moses were emphatically included. On almost the last recorded occasion of intercourse with His disciples, it is said, that "*beginning at Moses* and all the prophets, He expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." In the Epistles too, the words of Moses are quoted as being the testimony of the Holy Ghost; and on the holy Mount, Moses was seen glorified by the side of his glorified Lord. Could any greater attestation to the mission of Moses be given? "Moses," says the Scripture, "was faithful in all his House." What then must we say of those who, knowing all this, pretend to do homage to the Master, whilst they reject the servant whom that Master avowedly and solemnly accredited? Shall we say that a blinding delusion, an *ενεργεια πλανης*, has fallen upon the minds of such, or do they consciously deceive?

The supposed discoveries of Geology are made, as in the Essay before us, one of the chief grounds of attack on the historic veracity of Moses. It is obvious that if his narrative respecting the creation of "the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is' be false, every thing else that he has written may be false. And seeing that the Scripture every-

Digitized by Google

where recognises the divine authority of Moses, if Moses be discredited, the whole Scripture is discredited: and so, no authoritative exponent of Truth remains on earth: for as to the much-vaunted "verifying faculty" that is said to exist in every man's bosom, who would be so mad as to confide in that which not only contradicts Scripture and contradicts facts, but also leads those who profess to follow its guidance, to contradictory conclusions on the very same subjects?

Undeterred, however, by any such considerations as these, the Essay before us resolves to overthrow the authority of Moses. Throughout it, due care is taken to profit by every plausible occasion for sneering at any supposed instance of "the Hebrew writer's" ignorance; and at its conclusion, the writer plainly declares that the account given by Moses of creation is to be regarded "as the speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton, promulgated in all good faith as the best and most probable account that could then be given of God's universe." (p. 252.) In this passage the Essayist seems willing to concede to Moses, "the man of God," the high privilege of being classed with other fallible human speculators; yet even this concession is immediately after modified and virtually withdrawn, for he adds: "it has been sometimes felt "as a difficulty in taking this view of the case, that "the writer asserts so solemnly and unhesitatingly "that for which *he must have known* that he had no

Digitized by Google

"authority. But this arises only from our own "modern habits of thought, and from the modesty "of assertion which the spirit of true science has "taught us. Mankind has learnt caution through "repeated slips in the process of tracing out the "truth." (p. 252.)

Let every one mark well the statement of this awful passage. It is plain, unequivocal, and incapable of being modified by explanation. Moses is first pronounced a philosophic speculator, but he has not the modesty of *modern* speculators; nay more, he has not their truthfulness. What *they* state, they state conditionally and with reserve, whereas Moses "*asserts solemnly and unhesitatingly that for which he must have known that he had no authority.*" And what, if we add, as we should add, that Moses professed to state that which he stated *on the authority of God?* The charge against Moses really is, that he stated *as on the authority of God*, things for which he must have known that he had no authority.

One feels such a shrinking from men who can deliberately pen such sentiments as these, that the first impulse of one's heart is to court disagreement with them in every thing that their lips ever utter. There are some men whose disapproval we covet. We feel their praise to be condemnation—their censure honour. We would rather find ourselves opposed to them in everything, than even seemingly allied to them in one. The Essayists, however,

Digitized by Google

allow us not the opportunity for totality of dissent. They weave a tangled web. Error makes her most secure and most triumphant advances when she contrives to shelter herself under the temporary companionship of Truth.

The Essayist, then, maintains (and would that Christian writers had ever done the same) that the narrative respecting creation given in the commencement of Genesis professes to be a plain, historic narrative of facts. "It has nothing in it "which can properly be called poetical. It bears "on its face no trace of mystical or symbolical "meaning. Things are called by their right names "with a certain scientific exactness widely different "from the imaginative cosmogonies of the Greeks. ". . . . . In the first narrative none but a pro- "fessed mystifier of the school of Philo could see "anything but a plain statement of facts. There can "be little reasonable dispute then as to the sense in "which the Mosaic narrative was taken by those "who first heard it, nor is it indeed disputed that "for centuries, putting apart the Philonic mysticism, "which after all did not exclude a primary sense, "its words have been received in their genuine "and natural meaning." (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 223.)

Nothing can be more true than this, at least so far as concerns the great fact, that the first of Genesis does *profess* to be, what indeed it is, *a plain, literal narrative of creation.* Yet let it not

Digitized by Google

be supposed that the motive of the Essayist in admitting this is a desire to accredit Genesis. On the contrary, his object is to make its overthrow, as an authoritative witness of Truth, the more certain and complete.

The Essayist proceeds to examine the systems that have been devised to avoid the force of the statements in the first of Genesis: and first he notices that of the late Dr. Buckland. The first verse of Genesis (which is in truth a heading or preface to the whole chapter, declaring to us the Author of that creation of which the subsequent verses treat)—that verse is by Dr. Buckland's theory detached from the narrative that follows, and assigned to another period, thousands, or it may be, millions of years previous to the present Adamic creation—which creation, moreover, is not by this system regarded as being in the full sense a creation, but rather a new formation out of the ruin of a previously created and destroyed world.

If Dr. Buckland had merely asserted that the first verse of Genesis referred to the original creation of the unformed matter out of which the existing earth and heavens, and sun, and moon, and stars, were subsequently formed—if he had been willing to allow that before the *first* of the six days mentioned in Genesis when God said, "Let there be light," no light had existed—if he had admitted that before the *second* day no firmament had existed; and that before the *fourth* day no sun, moon, or stars had existed, his

Digitized by Google

theory (though still incapable of being reconciled with Holy Scripture) would yet have been comparatively free from those great inconsistencies by which it necessarily destroys itself. For to admit (as Dr. Buckland does admit) that the first of Genesis speaks of a series of six literal days, and that on the first of these days light was made; and on the second, the firmament; and on the fourth, the sun; and afterwards to affirm that both light and the firmament, as well as sun and moon and stars, existed hundred of ages previously, involves a contradiction so glaring, that it is difficult to conceive the process by which any one could reconcile himself to the reception of a system so self-destructive. The Essayist justly exposes its inconsistency. "Dr. Buckland," (I quote from the Essay) "having thus "endeavoured to make out that the Mosaic account "does not negative the idea that the sun, moon, "and stars had been created at the indefinitely "distant time designated by the word 'beginning,' "he is reduced to describe the primeval darkness of "the first day as 'a temporary darkness, produced "'by an accumulation of dense vapours upon the "'face of the deep.' An incipient dispersion of "these vapours may have readmitted light to the "earth, upon the first day, whilst the exciting cause "of light was obscured, and the further purification "of the atmosphere upon the fourth day, may have "caused the sun, and moon, and stars to appear in "the firmament of heaven, to assume their new re-

Digitized by Google

"lations to the newly modified earth, and to the "human race.

"It is needless (continues the Essayist) to dis- "cuss the scientific probability of this hypothesis, "but the violence done to the grand and simple "words of the Hebrew writer must strike every "mind. 'And God said, Let there be light, and "'there was light. And God saw the light, that it "'was good: and God divided the light from the "'darkness. And God called the light Day, and the "'darkness he called Night. And the evening and "'morning were the first day.' Can any one sensible "of the value of words suppose, that nothing more "is here described, or intended to be described, "than the partial clearing away of a fog? Can such "a manifestation of light have been dignified by "the appellation of day? Is not this reducing the "noble description which has been the admiration "of ages to a pitiful *caput mortuum* of empty ver- "biage? (*Essays*, p. 227.)

"It is no part of the commentator's or inter- "preter's duty (I still quote from the Essays) to "introduce obscurity or find difficulties where none "exist, and it cannot be pretended that, taking it "as a question of the use of words to express "thoughts, there are any peculiar difficulties about "understanding the first chapter of Genesis. . . . "The difficulties arise for the first time, when "we seek to import a meaning into the language "which it certainly never could have conveyed to

Digitized by Google

"those to whom it was originally addressed. . . .
". . . . . Although language may be, and often
"has been used, for the purpose, not of expressing,
"but concealing thought, no such charge can fairly
"be laid against the Hebrew writer."

"'It should be borne in mind,' says Dr. Buckland,
"'that the object of the account was, not to state
"'*in what manner*, but *by whom* the world was made.'
"Every one must see (I still quote from the Essays)
"that this is an unfounded assertion, inasmuch as
"the greater part of the narrative consists in a
"minute and orderly description of the manner in
"which things were made. We can know nothing
"as to the *object* of the account, except from the
"account itself. What the writer meant to state is
"just what he has stated, for all that we can know
"to the contrary. Or can we seriously believe that
"if appealed to by one of his Hebrew hearers or
"readers as to his intention, he would have replied,
"My only object in what I have written is to inform
"you that God made the world; as to the manner
"of His doing it, of which I have given so exact
"an account, I have no intention that my words
"should be taken in their literal meaning." (*Essays*, p. 232.)

Such is the comment of the Essayist on Dr. Buckland's system, which was also the system advocated by Dr. Chalmers and others. Who will deny that the comment is just? Are we to be told that light, and heat, and organised life, existed ages

Digitized by Google

before God said, "Let there be light;" and that the firmament was made and set to divide the waters, ages before that *second* day on which Genesis affirms that it was made; and that the sun, and moon, and stars, were made and set in the firmament and shone ages before that *fourth* day on which Genesis declares that they were made; are we to be told all this, and then asked to believe that the first of Genesis contains nothing that is at variance with such an interpretation—that it still may be received in its plain, natural sense? If such an interpretation be natural, I know not any that could be pronounced non-natural. The Essayist, as we have seen, pronounces such an interpretation of Genesis to be extravagant and impossible. Agreeing with Dr. Buckland in asserting that the sun, moon, and stars had; ages before the six-days-creation described in Genesis, "marked out seasons, and days, and years, and given light ages before, to the earth and to the animals which preceded man as its inhabitant," they hesitate not to avow that in holding this, they hold something *utterly and hopelessly at variance with the statements of Genesis.* Having to choose between their supposed facts and Scripture, they elect the former, and reject the testimony of the Word of God.

Amongst those who once adopted the theory of Dr. Buckland, but afterwards abandoned it, (not indeed on account of its being at variance with Scripture, but for other reasons) was the late Hugh

Digitized by Google

Miller. In 1857 he writes as follows: "I certainly "did once believe with Chalmers and Buckland that "the six days were simply natural days of twenty-'four hours each—that they had comprised the "entire work of the existing creation—and that the "latest of the geologic ages was separated by a "great chaotic gap from our own." (*Hugh Miller as quoted in Essays*, p. 228.) After recounting some of his labours as a practical geologist, he states that extended research had brought him to a new conclusion. "The conclusion (I again quote his words) "to which I have been compelled to arrive is, that "for many long ages ere man was ushered into being, "not a few of his humble contemporaries of the "fields and woods enjoyed life in their present "haunts, and that for thousands of years anterior "to even *their* appearance, many of the existing "molluscs lived in our seas. That *day* during which "the present creation came into being, and in which "God, when He had made 'the beast of the earth "'after his kind, and the cattle after their kind,' at "length terminated the work by moulding a creature "in His own image, to whom He gave dominion "over them all, was not a brief period of a few "hours duration, but extended over, mayhap, mil-"lenniums of centuries. No blank chaotic gap of "death and darkness separated the creation to which "man belongs from that of the old extinct elephant, "hippopotamus, and hyæna; for familiar animals, "such as the red deer, the roe, the fox, the wild

Digitized by Google

"cat, and the badger, lived throughout the period "which connected their time with our own; and so "I have been compelled to hold that the days of "creation were not natural but prophetic days, and "stretched far back into the bygone eternity. (*Testi-*"*mony of the Rocks*, p. 10.)

Without touching at present on the geologic phenomena, our first question is whether the word "day" as used in the first of Genesis is capable of being understood of a period of indefinite duration. That it *sometimes* denotes an extended period is true. As in human language, so in Scripture, a prolonged period is often denoted by "day" *when used apart from numerals.* Thus we speak of "the day of man," and of "the day of God:" the day of Solomon, the day of Nebuchadnezzar, and the like. No one doubts that in such uses of "day," an extended period is denoted. Indeed, in the second chapter of Genesis, "day" is used in this general sense, and extended to the whole period of creation. "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, *in the day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." (*Gen.* ii. 4.) But the case is entirely different when "day," or any other word denoting time is connected with numerals, such as one, two, three: first, second, third, &c. In all such cases "day" is defined and restricted in its application by the numeral appended to it. One day means one day; and six days mean six days;

Digitized by Google

nor is there any departure from this obvious rule from one end of the Scripture to the other.*

Now I scarcely need say, that in the first of Genesis we have not only a regular succession of days marked by conjoined numerals, "day one," "second day," "third day," and the like, but we have also the word "day" defined as being evening and morning—"the evening and the morning was day one." Nor is this all: as in Genesis, so in Exodus where God Himself speaks from Sinai, we find the seventh day on which God rested, set in contrast with the six preceding days of creation. "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter . . . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." (*Exodus* xx. 9, 11.) I have never heard

* "Our honourable master Saadias," says Aben Ezra, "expounds correctly and well. . . . . Know also that in Holy Scripture days are always days, and never years. Yet it is possible that the word 'days' may mean an entire year, since the repetition of the days produces a return of the year, as when it is said in Ex. xiii. 10, from days to days, *i.e.* from year to year; days meaning a complete year. But when the number is stated, as two days, three days, it cannot mean years, but must be days as it stands." For further observations on this subject, see "*Aids to Prophetic Inquiry*," as advertised at end.

Digitized by Google

of any one who maintained that the seventh sabbatical day was other than a literal day, and if it be, the question is settled; for language must cease to be a guide, if *in the same context* the seventh day of a series is to be regarded as a *literal* day, and the six preceding days of the same series regarded as periods of indefinite duration. Besides, as is well observed by the Essayists, the bare theory that a day means an age or immense geological period might be made to yield some rather strange results. "What becomes of the evening and morn-
" ing of which each day is said to have consisted?
" Was each geologic age divided into two long
" intervals, one all darkness, the other all light?
" And if so, what became of the plants and trees
" created in the third day or period, when the even-
" ing of the fourth day (the evenings, be it observed,
" precede the mornings) set in? They must have
" passed through half a seculum of total darkness,
" not even cheered by that dim light which the sun,
" not yet completely manifested, supplied on the
" morning of the third day. Such an ordeal would
" have completely destroyed the whole vegetable
" creation, and yet we find that it survived, and was
" appointed on the sixth day as the food of men
" and animals. In fact we need only substitute the
" word 'period' for 'day' in the Mosaic narrative to
" make it very apparent that the writer at least had
" no such meaning, nor could he have conveyed any
" such meaning to those who first heard his account

Digitized by Google

"read." (*Essays*, p. 240.) We are justified then, I think, in rejecting this theory without further remark. If we could believe that each of the six days mentioned in Genesis denoted a period of, perhaps ten thousand years, and that such period was divided into a night of 5,000 years, and into a day of 5,000 years, and that vegetable and subsequently animal life existed during such nights and such days, we certainly should excel in credulity, but it surely would be the credulity of folly—not of wisdom. Wisdom is only credulous when it knows that God hath spoken.

A third system has been proposed by Archdeacon Pratt. Adopting in part the system of Buckland, so far as to maintain that the first verse of Genesis describes an anterior creation stretching back into ages of unlimited extent, and unconnected with human existence; and maintaining also with Buckland that the six days of the first of Genesis are literal, he endeavours to reconcile his system with the statements of Genesis by regarding the first of Genesis not as speaking of natural things according to their *physical realities*, but merely according to their *appearances*. "According to this explanation," (I quote the words of Archdeacon Pratt) "the first "chapter of Genesis does not pretend (as has been "generally assumed) to be a cosmogony, or an "account of the original creation of the material "universe. The only cosmogony which it contains, "in that sense at least, is confined to the sublime

"declaration of the first verse, 'In the beginning "God created the heavens and the earth.' The in- "spired record thus stepping over an interval of "indefinite ages with which man has no direct con- "cern, proceeds at once to narrate the events pre- "paratory to the introduction of man on the scene; "employing phraseology strictly faithful to the "*appearances* which would have met the eye of man, "could he have been a spectator on the earth of "what passed during those six days. . . . . The "foregoing explanation many have now adopted. "It is sufficient for my purpose, if it be a possible "explanation, and if it meet the difficulties of the case. That it is possible in itself, is plain from the "fact above established, that the Scriptures wisely "speak on natural things according to their *appear-* "*ances* rather than their *physical realities*. It meets "the difficulties of the case, because all the diffi- "culties hitherto started against this chapter on "scientific grounds proceeded on the principle that "it is a cosmogony; which this explanation repu- "diates, and thus disposes of the difficulties. It is "therefore an explanation satisfactory to my own "mind. I may be tempted to regret that I can gain "no certain scientific information from Genesis re- "garding the process of the original creation; but I "resist the temptation, remembering the great object "for which the Scripture was given—to tell man of "his origin and fall, and to draw his mind to his "Creator and Redeemer. Scripture was not de-

Digitized by Google

"signed to teach us natural philosophy, and it is "vain to attempt to make a cosmogony out of its "statements. The Almighty declares Himself the "originator of all things, but He condescends not to "describe the process or the laws by which He "worked. All this He leaves for reason to decipher "from the phenomena which His world displays." Pratt as quoted in *Essays*, p. 235.

Such is the statement of Archdeacon Pratt. "We "venture to think" (write the Essayists) "that the "world at large will continue to consider the account "in the first chapter of Genesis to be a cosmogony. "But as it is here admitted that it does not describe "physical realities, but only outward appearances, "that is, gives a description false in fact, and one "which can teach us no scientific truth whatever, it "seems to matter little what we call it. If its de-"scription of the events of the six days which it "comprises be merely one of appearances and not "of realities, it can teach us nothing regarding them." (*Essays*, p. 235.)

Can we take exception to this comment of the Essayist? I think not. All the objections which have been already urged against the theory of Dr. Buckland bear with equal force against that of Archdeacon Pratt. When Genesis tells me that light and the firmament, and the sun, moon, and stars, were made on certain days which it specifies, am I to understand it, not as meaning that these things were really made at that time, but merely

Digitized by Google

that they *appeared* to be made—that in reality they existed ages and ages previously? If such a principle be adopted, I do not see how it could be proved that Adam was created on the sixth day! If the sun which is said to have been made on the fourth day was not then *really* made, but only *seemed* to be made, why may it not be said that Adam who is said to have been made on the sixth day, was not then *really* made, but only *appeared* to be made? Historic verities vanish before a principle like this; and the result would be a system of universal Docetism. That the object of the Bible is not to make us philosophers is most evident. It is true, likewise, that when Scripture has occasion to allude to certain ordinary occurrences familiar to the thoughts and eyes of men, and is not professing to give precise and definite didactic explanations—in such cases, it adopts, as might be expected, the popular expressions conventionally in use amongst men, and shuns the parade of philosophic accuracy. Men speak, and the Scripture speaks of the sun "rising," "setting," and the like; and who would not marvel to hear these well-known expressions pedantically supplanted by others of technical correctness? But such cases have no resemblance to the present. The first of Genesis is a chapter in which man and *his* mode of contemplating, or beholding, or naming things, has emphatically no place. It is a chapter peculiarly devoted to God and the almighty operations of

Digitized by Google

His hand—the avowed object of the chapter being to teach us *how* and *in what order* God called all existing things, ourselves among the number, out of non-existence into being. If strict historical veracity is not to be expected when God undertakes to describe the facts of His own creative agency, when is it to be expected? If we adopt a principle like this, we may as well abandon ourselves at once to an universal Docetism, and say that the Scripture always deals with appearances—not with facts. I must say so, if I could once bring myself to believe that the terms, "came into being," "create," "make," used in the first of Genesis, denote appearances merely, not realities—that light, for example, appeared to be brought into being on the first day, but that really it was brought into being myriads of centuries before.*

* The Essayists do not notice the system of Dr. Pye Smith, probably because they deemed it unworthy of their regard. It is thus commented on by Hugh Miller: "The scheme of reconciliation adopted by the late Dr. Pye Smith, though, save in one particular, identical, as I have said, with that of Dr. Chalmers, is made, in virtue of its single point of difference, to steer clear of the difficulty. Both schemes exhibit the creation recorded in Genesis as an event which took place about six thousand years ago; both describe it as begun and completed in six natural days; and both represent it as cut off from a previously existing creation by a chaotic period of death and darkness. But while, according to the scheme of Chalmers, both the Biblical creation and the previous period of death are represented as co-extensive with the globe, they are represented, according to that of

Digitized by Google

What then are the statements of the first chapter of Genesis simply and literally taken? In the first verse we find a prefatory statement, declaring WHO

Dr. Smith, as limited and local. They may have extended, it is said, over only a few provinces of Central Asia, in which, when all was life and light in other parts of the globe, there reigned for a time only death and darkness amid the welterings of a chaotic sea: which, at the Divine command, was penetrated by light, and occupied by dry land, and ultimately, ere the end of the creative week, became a centre in which certain plants and animals, and finally man himself, were created. And this scheme, by leaving to the geologist in this country and elsewhere, save mayhap in some unknown Asiatic district, his unbroken series, certainly does not conflict with the facts educed by geologic discovery. It virtually removes Scripture altogether out of the field. I must confess, however, that on this, and on some other accounts, it has *failed to satisfy me*. . . . . I am disposed, I must add, to look for a broader and more general meaning in that grand description of the creation of all things with which the divine record so appropriately opens, than I could recognise it as forming were I assured it referred to but one of many existing creations;—a creation restricted to mayhap a few hundred square miles of country, and to mayhap a few scores of animals and plants." (*Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 130). Such is the comment of Hugh Miller. Well may he say that Dr. Pye Smith's system "removes Scripture altogether out of the field." *He* must have formed a strong estimate of the credulity of the human mind and its readiness to listen to any absurdity, who could venture to ask us to believe that Moses when describing "the earth as without form and void, &c.," meant only that a few miles of territory in the centre of Asia were covered with a temporary miraculous darkness!!! Such statements have pre-

Digitized by Google

it was that by His own creative and formative power brought the Heavens and Earth and all things in them, into that completed condition of being which the subsequent verses describe. "In the beginning GOD created the Heavens and the Earth." The emphasis is on *God*. It was He who "in the beginning," that is, before any of the things subsequently described had any being, did by His own almighty power "create," "form," and "make" them all.

The two prominent words used in the first and second of Genesis of God as bringing all things into completed being, are "to create" (בראׁ), and "to make" (עשׂה). These words, as used in these chapters, may be regarded as virtually synonymous. There is no "making" spoken of in these chapters that does not involve "creating;" and no "creating" that does not imply formation and completion as its inseparable concomitants. In interpreting words in any given passage, we are not concerned with that which they may in other circumstances mean; we are concerned only with that which they mean in the contextual connection in which we find them. Scripture often defines its own expressions; and such is the case here. In the second chapter we find the words, "all His work which God *created and made*" (verse 3); and again, "these are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they

pared a "practicable breach" in the walls of our citadel, which the more advanced Infidelity of the present hour knows how to avail itself of.

Digitized by Google

were *created,* in the day that the Lord God *made* the earth and the heavens" (verse 4). This last verse clearly shows that the creating and making are not acts separated by an interval of countless ages, but that they both alike belong to the six-day period of which the first of Genesis treats. The words "created" and "made" (verse 3) clearly show that these two expressions indicate, not different acts, but only different aspects of the same act; "create" directing the mind to the work as viewed from its origin—the other to the work as viewed with reference to its completeness.*

* These words בּרא לעשׂות are by some translated, *qui creaverat Deus faciendo*—which God had created in making. See Wright's Genesis, p. 5. Gesenius observes that when one verb serves to complete the meaning of another, it often stands in the infinitive preceded by ל, thus forming a kind of Gerund. See Gesenius Gr. § 45. 3 and § 139. 2. Compare Gen. xxvii. 20, מהרת למצא, "thou hast hastened to find," i.e. hast quickly found. So here: he hath creatively, or by creation made, showing how closely the two verbs are associated in meaning. For further remarks on this subject, see Supplementary Remarks, page 89.

That בּרא in Hebrew, like κτιζω in Greek, is continually used to denote production out of nothing, will I suppose be questioned by few. "All the Hebrew writers," says Fagius, "explain בּרא in this place as meaning to create out of nothing." Rabbi Nachman says, "we have no word in the holy language to express production out of nothing except בּרא." And Kimchi says: "the interpretation of 'creation' (בריאה) is the making something new, and its being brought from non-existence into existence." (*Fagius*

Digitized by Google

That the first verse is to be regarded as a preface or heading to the chapter, and that it is not intended to give the *order* of creation is manifest from this, that it speaks *first* of that which was created *last*; for the earth was created before the firmament—

---

in Crit. Sacr.) Moreover, we are expressly told on Divine authority that when the things that we now see (τα βλεπομενα) were made, they were not made out of things that did appear (Heb. xi. 3, μη εκ των φαινομενων τα βλεπομενα γεγονεναι). In the first and second of Genesis, the words "create" (ברא), "form," or "fashion" (יצר) and "make" (עשה) are all applied to God as the one almighty agent, who, in bringing the earth and heavens into their appointed completeness, did "create" them, and "fashion" them, and "make," *i.e.* perfect them, by bringing them into that condition which they attained when finished. See the connection of these words in Isaiah xliii. 7. "I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him." On this verse Kimchi observes to the following effect: "I have *created* him; that is, produced him out of nothing: next, I *formed* him; caused him to exist in a form or shape appointed: lastly, I *made* him; that is, made the final dispositions and arrangements respecting him; for the word מעשה signifies the final arrangement or perfection of a thing." In translating the first verse of Genesis, Josephus uses εκτισε, but the Septuagint εποιησε; no doubt fearing lest if they used κτιζω it might be interpreted in a sense that would fall short of the completion indicated by ποιεω. Compare also הבראי in Is. xlv. 17, which is virtually translated in Rev. xxi. 5. Ιδου καινα παντα ποιω. "I *make* all things new." When the new heavens and earth shall be *made* it will be strictly a new *creation:* for the former heavens and earth shall pass away, and no place be found for them.

Digitized by Google

"the earth" here denoting, *in virtue of its contrast with "the heavens,"* the whole globe, both water and land—that which we are accustomed to call "earth" in contrast with "the heavens." The earth, *so defined*, was made on the *first* day; whereas the earth, *in another sense*, as contrasted not with the heavens but with *the waters*, and therefore called "dry-land," was made on the *third* day.*

The second verse proceeds to give *the order of creation.* On the first day the earth was made. It "came into existence" (הָיְתָה—*εγενετο.* See Gesenius) shapeless and void. No root, seed, plant, or animal, existed in it. It was encompassed by and buried in water over which the Spirit of God, as the agent of His creative and disposing power, hovered or brooded. But on the *first* day of the earth's creation, God said, "Let light come into being, and ight came into being" (*γενηθητω φως, και εγενετο*

* It is important to distinguish between the meaning of earth when used to denote the whole terraqueous globe and when used in the more limited sense of "dry land," the sense in which it is used in verse 10. In the first verse it bears the wider sense, and is used in connexion with "Heavens" to denote the whole of the Adamic inanimate creation, just as we often find "flesh and blood" used in a general sense to denote Adamic humanity—humanity in its natural condition. See for example 1 Cor. xv. 50, "*Flesh and blood* shall not inherit the kingdom of God." The first verse, therefore, teaches us that the whole of the celestial and terrestrial fabric known by us—the heavens and the earth, had God for their *creative* maker. His making was not a mere making; it was a creative making.

Digitized by Google

φως). But the light thus created was not, as afterwards on the fourth day, connected with the sun and moon as "*light-bearers*" (מְאֹרוֹת *luminaria*), dispensing it and regulating its diffusion. Yet the light was nevertheless concentrated. It was not allowed to mingle with the darkness, but was severed from it. "God divided between the light and the darkness." Consequently, a fixed place in relation to the earth being appointed to the light, the diurnal revolution of the earth on its axis would cause, as now, a succession of darkness and light, and thus there was night and day; "and the evening and the morning were day one."

On the second day, by the creation of the firmament, the waters that over-lay the earth were divided —part remaining on the earth, the other part being separated off, and by the firmament, upheld. This evidently implies that the firmament has solidity and strength, whence its Greek and Latin names στερεωμα and *firmamentum*, and the Hebrew רָקִיעַ signifying something that is beat out, like metal by a hammer, and therefore hard and firm. "In it," says Gesenius sneeringly, "the stars were supposed to be fixed; and over it the Hebrews believed there was a heavenly ocean." What the faithful among the Hebrews believed was, not that there was "a heavenly ocean:" they believed that there was a mighty mass of waters beyond the created firmament, and sustained by it. And how could they believe otherwise, when they knew not only that Moses had historically declared the fact, but also

Digitized by Google

that David had said, "Praise ye Jehovah, ye heavens of heavens, *and ye waters that are above the heavens.*" (Ps. cxlviii. 4.) "The work of the second day" (says the Essayist, and here I accept his testimony), "is to erect the vault of heaven (Heb. *rakiah;* Gr. "στερεωμα; Lat. *firmamentum*) which is represented "as supporting an ocean of water above it. The "waters are said to be divided, so that some are "below, some above the vault. That the Hebrews "understood the sky, firmament, or heaven, to be a "permanent solid vault, as it appears to the ordi-'nary observer, is evident enough from many ex-"pressions made use of concerning it. It is said to "have '*pillars*' ["the pillars of the heavens tremble "and are astonished at His reproof," Job xxvi. 11]: "'*foundations*' ["the foundations of the heavens "moved and shook because He was wroth," 2 Sam. "xxii. 8]: '*doors*' ["and opened the doors of the "heavens," Ps. lxxviii. 23]: '*windows*' ["the win-"dows," literally apertures, "of the heavens were "opened," Gen. vii. 11]. No quibbling about the "derivation of the word *rakiah*, which is literally "something beaten out, can affect the explicit de-"claration of the Mosaic writer, contained in the "words, 'the waters that are above the firmament.'" (*Essays*, p. 220.) With all this I thoroughly accord, but not with the impious words that follow. See them in the note below.*

* The concluding words are: "or avail to show that he Moses) was aware that the sky is but transparent space."

Digitized by Google

It is scarcely necessary to increase the length of these remarks by recounting the operations of the Divine hand during the remaining days of creation. What description of them can be given plainer or more simple than that which Genesis itself supplies? Some persons indeed have chosen to perplex themselves and others with imaginary difficulties, because they find that the second chapter of Genesis does not chronologically follow the first, but is, on the contrary, supplementary — retracing the period of which the previous chapter treats, and adding new points of detail. But this method of instruction is not peculiar to these chapters; it is found throughout the whole of Scripture. The whole of Scripture may be said to be writtten on this principle of recurrence. Not only in successive chapters, but frequently in succeeding paragraphs of the same chapter, we find that after the first chapter or first paragraph has carried on the instruction to a certain point, the next chapter or next paragraph instead of advancing, turns back and retraces the whole or part of the ground already trodden — presenting fresh aspects or adding new circumstances, until the narrative is brought up to the same point again. They who have not observed this, and who are stumbled at finding that the second chapter of Genesis treats of the same period as the first, may possibly be well

A day is soon coming that will determine who has spoken truth respecting these things — whether God, or they who trample under foot His testimonies.

Digitized by Google

read — well instructed in other things — but their Bibles they can have studied but little.*

Taking then the narrative of Genesis simply as it stands, I do not see what difficulty it presents to those who remember that it avowedly treats of almighty power working *miraculously*. "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." What madness, then, if we believe this, to measure the ways of God by any standard supplied by our own most imperfect, as well as limited, knowledge. How can things which are avowedly *beyond* the scope of human experience be tested by the rules of human experience? We have to remember too that the Scripture does not profess to supply a full narrative of *all* the circumstances connected with the events it records: it avowedly supplies a partial narrative only, omitting such circumstances as are not necessary to the enunciation of the truth or fact intended to be declared. Hence our knowledge is necessarily imperfect—we know in part, although that which we

* It may, perhaps, be well to notice an error in the English translation of Gen. i. 20. That verse should be rendered: "And God said, Let the waters swarm with swarming creatures that have life, and let fowl fly above the earth," &c. According to our present translation it would appear that the waters brought forth the fowl, which would contradict Gen. ii. 19, where we are expressly told that the fowl were made out of *the ground*.

Digitized by Google

do know we know *surely*. Thirdly, the Scripture teaches us that we are to receive its statements, not on the ground of their probability—not on the ground of their seeming wise or reasonable to our natural thoughts—not on the ground of their being sustained by inferences drawn from real or apparent facts—we receive the Scripture because we confide in the faithfulness and truth of Him from whom it cometh. If experience or facts ascertainable by human power were the criterion, who would not say that it was impossible that a fish could swallow a man, or that a man could continue to exist when thus doubly entombed in the mighty deep? But when I know that God has revealed it as an act of His power *working miraculously*, what difficulty can I have in believing? Are not all things possible with God? And has He not told me that at present I am to walk, not by sight, but by faith?

Faith, however, is not superstitious credulity. It seeks for evidence, and that evidence God supplies. The *external* evidence* by which the authority of the Old and New Testaments is proved, is such as no sane mind that duly weighs it could honestly reject. And when we add to this the internal evidence (that which is appreciable only by those who,

* See as *an example* of this kind of evidence an excellent "Defence of the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel," in "Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of the Book of Daniel," by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D., page 227. This "Defence" is also published separately by Bagster.

Digitized by Google

being taught by the Spirit of God, are able to understand the things about which God writes) the demonstration is complete. "If any man," said the Lord Jesus, "will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." When the heart has once learned to trust God, and to listen to the instruction of His word respecting sin and atonement and salvation—when it has indeed discovered that nothing but sovereign grace freely saving on the ground of Another's merits, can meet a sinner's need, it will soon find in the Scripture, evidences of its Divine authority multiplied on every page. To one instructed in the school of God the Scripture as it is read, supplies each moment, demonstrative evidence of its Divine authority, just as harmony in music proves its own presence to the instructed ear. A Christian who really searches the Scripture *as a whole*—who remembers that the Prophets as well as the Apostles have written for our learning, will find in all that has happened and is happening to the Church, and to Israel, and to the nations, fresh evidence every day that the Scripture is indeed the work of Omniscience. Yet though conscious of being instructed, he knows that he is instructed only partially: what he understands, he knows that he understands only in part. He pretends to no completeness of knowledge. He knows too that God has not given him any warrant to expect that conclusions based by men on the accuracy of their own historic records, or on the evidence of supposed

Digitized by Google

philosophic facts will be found in accordance with His own Word. He knows that often he may have to say, "Let God be true, and every man a liar:" in a word, he is content to walk not by sight, but by faith.

The readiness, and indeed eagerness, which even true Christians have shown in bending and twisting the words of Scripture so as to force them into apparent accordance with the supposed facts of Geology, or rather with the inferences that geologists have made from these facts real or supposed, has brought great sin upon the Church of God—a sin which even still seems little recognised or repented of. And what has been gained by this desertion of the literal truthfulness of God's word? Has its abandonment appeased the fierce wrath of the enemies of Truth? Has it turned aside the fury of their assault? No. It has given them fresh vigour, and furnished them with new weapons wherewith to assail our citadel. It has caused infidelity to exalt itself more proudly, and to boast that it has succeeded at last in convicting of falsehood the God of holiness and Truth. "I have adverted" (says one of the Essayists now no more) "to the question of dis-
"crepancies between science and the language of
"Scripture generally, and have referred more especi-
"ally to that notable instance of it—the irreconcilable
"contradiction between the whole view opened to us
"by geology, and the narrative of the Creation in
"the Hebrew Scriptures, whether as briefly delivered

Digitized by Google

"from Sinai, or as expounded in Genesis. In the "minds of *all competently informed persons* at the "present day, after a long struggle for existence, "the literal belief in the Judaical cosmogony, it may "now be said, has died a natural death. Yet many "are still haunted by its *phantom*, which perpetually "disturbs their minds with apprehensions equally "groundless on collateral points."*

Awful words these! They assert not only that the words which Moses was inspired to write are false, but also that that which God Himself audibly spoke on Sinai is false. He indeed who dared to write these things is now no more—his lips are silent in death: but the sentiment survives, and is by multitudes received and welcomed; and even they who receive it *not*, seem little to *feel* its awfulness; or if they feel it, are too inert or too timorous to give vigorous expression to what they feel, and to encounter the consequences of faithful action.†

* Powell's "Unity of Worlds," p. 457.

† One writer on Geology observes, that if certain operations be allowed to be miraculous (he is speaking of the Flood) "then we must give up the idea of philosophizing about it, and believe the facts simply on the Divine testimony. For how can we philosophise upon an event that is brought about by the direct efficiency of God, and without reference to existing natural laws, and, it may be, in contravention of them, &c." (*Hitchcock's Religion of Geology*, p. 114.) This is just the simple truth. It seems, indeed, little short of madness, to affirm, with the Scriptures in our hand, that the operations of God at the Creation, at the Fall, at the

Digitized by Google

Geology, like astronomy, or any other such science, whilst it employs itself in the ascertainment of facts is innocent, and useful for the purposes of life; but the moment it quits this comparatively lowly path and is tempted, instead of collecting and registering facts, to substitute conjecture and hypothesis for

---

Flood, at the descent on Sinai, and on other occasions of which we have no detailed record, were the result of the operation of mere ordinary natural laws with which we are familiar, and that His agency was not in the full sense *miraculous*. And if it be *miraculous*, then by the confession of Dr. Hitchcock himself, there is an end to philosophising. To admit that there is an Almighty Being, and yet to aver that He did not act *miraculously* on the occasions referred to is as contrary to right reason as it is to revelation. And what am I asked to believe when I discard miraculous agency and admit the fancied mythical agencies of the geologists? I must believe "that the epoch of the earth's creation is unrevealed" (*Hitchcock, Lect. II.*) — that "death" (which Scripture declares to have entered by one man's sin) "was a universal law of organic beings on the globe from the beginning" (*Hitchcock, Lect. III.*)—that the Flood was limited in extent, prevailing only in the districts contiguous to Armenia, and that it was not destructive of *all* human and animal life (*Hugh Miller, Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 346—*Hitchcock, Lect. IV., and various other writers*)—and that it is doubtful whether it be possible to identify one mark of that event (the Noachic Deluge) in nature. (*Hitchcock*, p. 111.) We are asked to admit all this, and many other like things, (all falsifying Scripture) and to reject the thought of miraculous agency on the part of God, in order that Geologist may not be obstructed in inventing mythical theories to *account for* their real, or supposed facts.

Digitized by Google

facts, and to endeavour to account for its facts by unproved theories, it abandons the sphere of inductive science, and becomes the slave and dupe of vain, empty, deceiving speculativeness. One has to seek among the sophists of Athens, or the Gnostics of Alexandria for parallels to the grandiloquent self-complacency displayed by those who have been during the last few weeks, magnifying their discoveries of flint spear-heads, and arrow-heads, and bones of pre-Adamic men in the caves of Abbeville. The *αλαζονεια* of these writers (not to speak of their disdainful rejection of Scripture) would be in itself enough to disgust and alienate any right-toned mind. Nor are they agreed as to their facts. One might smile (if the subject were not too solemn) to see how the statements of one week by one writer, are set aside the next week by another. Yet both alike are positive. Are we to humble and abase the banner of God's Truth in the presence of men like these? And even supposing that we could ascertain with perfect certainty every present fact connected with the earth's physical condition, would such an induction enable us to determine the times and the causes of the phenomena thus presented? Evidently not: for the simple reason, that even if our induction of facts were perfect (and who would assert the possibility of this?) yet even then, unless we had access to a sphere of knowledge entirely beyond the scope of human intelligence, we should be utterly unable to account with certainty for our facts, or to form conclu-

Digitized by Google

sions as to the causes and times of the phenomena before us. Geologists in affirming that this earth was created before the time at which God says it was created, ground their assumption in part on the discovery of certain phenomena which they say prove that the earth once existed in a very different condition from that in which we now behold it; and that it is very evident that some great act of destruction, either universal or well nigh universal, has spread ruin over it; and then come their various theories to account for the appearances they have discovered. But what weight can any one of these theories have with us, when once we discover that one of the points most material in the consideration of such a question is omitted altogether? This *Adamic* earth—the earth whose creation is described in the first of Genesis, came into existence in a condition utterly different, *circumstantially*, from that in which we now behold it. Have Geologists ever thought of defining, or are they able to define with accuracy the condition of the paradisiacal earth? Have they ever thought of contrasting with the condition of this fallen earth, as we now know it, its unfallen paradisiacal form when it first came, fair, and perfect, and blessed, from the hand of its Creator? Never. I never heard of one geological writer that has even endeavoured to say in what respects the present condition of this earth contrasts with its pristine condition of perfectness. They have evidently never reflected on the subject—it has

Digitized by Google

had no place in their thoughts. In all their discussions they have overlooked the all-important fact that this earth has had, not *one unchanged condition*, but *two contrasted conditions* of existence since its Creator brought it into being in the six literal days described in Genesis. It is the same earth, indeed, but circumstantially how changed! Any theory, therefore, that pretends to account for the earth's present physicial condition, if it ignore the greatness of that change which took place at the Fall (and all present geological theories do) must be utterly worthless. It cannot even have *the semblance* of plausibility to a reflective mind. The great and all important period of change in the whole fabric of creation at the time when man fell, and sin and death entered, and when God, as the Scripture tells us, subjected all creation "to the bondage of corruption"—that period and its resulting consequences, they utterly ignore.

The Scripture tells us that "by one offence"—the one transgression of Adam, death entered and reigned. See Rom. v. 12, and 17. To this statement I strictly adhere. The Scriptures do not limit the reign of death and of corruption to man, and facts prove that it is not limited to man. Am I to be told that the God of life and goodness created this earth with one thing in it that was marked by ruin or death? How in that case could He have pronounced it "very good"—how could He have

Digitized by Google

rejoiced in and rested in it? It would not have been very good: He could not have rested in it. We know that at present "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together:" but it was not created in this travail. A judicial act of God in consequence of the first man's sin, has subjected it to the bondage of corruption; from which, however, through the Second Man, it will, by-and-by, be delivered. What I maintain, then, is, that up to the period of Adam's sin, all in creation was positively perfect. I maintain that up to that time, no death, no decay, or dissolution, no process involving destruction of life—no effects or consequences of destructive judgment, existed either amongst animals or men. Nothing that spoke of ruin was presented to the eye, or to the thought of angel, or of man, for no such thing existed. Not only the surface of the earth, but the earth's lowest parts down to its inmost centre were marked, not by traces of convulsion, distortion, and fiery dissolution, but by the presence of absolute perfectness, bearing witness to the life-giving and sustaining power of God. But when man sinned, and when with him creation fell, all was changed. He whose almighty fiat had called light into being, appointed now by a like act of almighty power that death should penetrate and reign over all things. Inward fires that before had never operated to destroy, were now caused to rage destructively within the earth's bowels. The fact

Digitized by Google

that they do there rage destructively, even philosophy admits, and every volcano proves.* Does any one believe that these raging fires burnt within the earth's bowels at first, or that the traces of their agency, as seen in fused rocks and mountains thrown up from the earth's surface,† were found marking upon the earth the stamp of *judgment*, when first it existed in its pristine paradisiacal perfectness? Is it not a fact, plainly attested by Scripture, that Sh'ohl or Hades, (in the lowest division of which, called in Scripture "the lowest Hades," the departed souls of the wicked are at present confined,) is formed within the earth's bowels?‡ Surely

* "Let us take the extreme estimate of forty miles as the depth below which the matter composing the earth is completely liquefied. [by fire]. This depth is the one-hundredth part of the terrestrial radius. We are then to regard the earth as a spherical shell of solid matter filled with liquid fire. . . . . If the egg of a fowl or an ostrich be imagined to represent the earth, its shell would be much too thick to represent the earth's solid crust!" ("Earthquakes and Volcanoes," Lardner's *Popular Geology*, § 8.)

† "The central fluid [fiery] matter pressing unequally on its confining shell, has at various times cracked it in different directions, and the molten mineral matter, issuing from the fissures, and gradually cooling, ... has formed mountain chains over the fissures. Such has been the operation by which the vast ridges of the Andes, which traverse the new continent from north to south, and those of the Alps and Himalaya, which traverse the old continents from east to west, have been formed." (*Ibid.* § 10.)

‡ For further remarks on the *locality* of Hades, see note

Digitized by Google

no such place, indicative of the triumph of sin and death, could have existed when all throughout the whole creation was good, perfect and blessed. No place of anguish—no *penal* prison-house, nor indeed any prison-house can be supposed to have existed in the bowels of the earth then. But this globe, once appointed to be the witness of the life-giving power of God for good, has since become a witness of His destructive power in judgment. What part of the earth's crust (for since Sh'ohl or Hades was formed, and internal fires began to operate destructively, the earth is but a crust) does not bear witness to the action of violent and destructive agencies, not only by contortion, dislocation, and the like, but by their very constitution? How then can we suppose that any such appearances in the earth's strata existed when first the earth came into its perfected being, and was pronounced very good? A direct intervention from God (an intervention not less miraculous, and

---

subjoined to this paper. There can be little doubt that the vast mountain chains thrown up on the earth's surface by the action of fire, were thrown up when Hades was formed within the earth's bowels, not previous to, but after the fall. There was in Hades a part assigned to the blessed; and there the soul of our blessed Lord was, during the time that His body was in the grave. It is evident that the interior of the earth was not occupied *entirely* by fire *then*. *Now*, probably, it is. Hades is spoken of as "enlarging itself" from time to time. See Isaiah v. 14.

Digitized by Google

possibly not more prolonged, than that which first called the earth into being) smote it with the stroke of judgment—a stroke that in all probability penetrated like an electric shock to its lowest parts. At first the earth was adapted to the condition which man held in happiness and innocency; afterwards it became altered to meet the condition of man as fallen, and was subjected to the reign of death. The dislocation and disruption of the earth's strata and their various arrangements — the collocation of coal fields, metalliferous districts, and the like, have doubtless been appointed with anticipative reference to the need of man as fallen, and with a certain reference too, to the destined place which each nation and tribe should hold in human history till the great end shall come. The mere circumstance then, that all present geologic theories ignore these truths, and give no place to the great fact of creation being subjected to the bondage of corruption and the reign of death, is in itself sufficient to invalidate their conclusions.

One might suppose from the boldness with which geologists break through the restraints of Scripture when they impede their theories, that they are themselves thoroughly agreed. But they are agreed neither in their theories, nor their facts. What one avers another repudiates. It is impossible, therefore, to find any one geologic writer whose statements would not be impugned by some other

Digitized by Google

geologist; and consequently, there is no one fixed geologic theory which can be tested as to the amount of its agreement or disagreement with the Word of God; for no one acknowledged theory exists. All that we can do, therefore, is to select one out of the many published theories; and I have selected that of the late Hugh Miller.

One acknowledgment of Hugh Miller is important. He once supposed with Buckland, Chalmers, and others, that a blank chaotic gap of death and darkness separated the creation to which man belongs from another that preceded. This notion in his last work he entirely repudiates. He rejects it as utterly inconsistent with established geologic facts. Although still believing that there was a creation of animals and vegetables that preceded the creation to which man belongs, he nevertheless admits that not a few of the animals which belonged to the supposed previous creation, continue still. "No blank chaotic gap of death and darkness "separated the creation to which man belongs "from that of the old extinct elephant, hippo- "potamus and hyæna; for familiar animals such "as the red deer, the roe, the fox, the wild "cat and the badger, lived throughout the period "which connected their time with our own." (*Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 10.) When we remember the many unscriptural theories that have been founded on this supposed "blank chaotic gap," we may

Digitized by Google

be thankful that it is at last renounced even by geologists themselves.*

The system of Hugh Miller may be judged of from the following extracts. "The geologist," (he writes) "in his attempts to collate the Divine "with the geologic record, has, I repeat, only "three of the six periods of creation to account "for—the period of plants, the period of great "sea-monsters and creeping things, and the period "of cattle and beasts of the earth. He is called "on to question his systems and formations re- "garding the remains of these three great periods, "and of them only. And the question once fairly "stated, what, I ask, is the reply? All geologists "agree in holding that the vast geological scale, "naturally divides into three great parts. There "are many lesser divisions—divisions into systems, "formations, deposits, beds, strata; but the master "divisions, in each of which we find a type of "life so unlike that of the others, that even the "unpractised eye can detect the difference, are "simply three: the palæozoic, or oldest fossiliferous "division; the secondary, or middle fossiliferous "division; and the tertiary, or latest fossiliferous "division. In the first, or palæozoic division, we

* The Essayist observes: "this theory (*i.e.* the theory of the chaotic gap adopted by Buckland and Chalmers) is by no means supported by geological phenomena, and is, we suppose, rejected by all geologists whose authority is valuable." *Essays*, p. 228.

Digitized by Google

"find corals, crustaceans, molluscs, fishes; and in "its later formations, a few reptiles. But none of "these classes give its leading character to the "palæozoic; they do not constitute its prominent "feature, or render it more remarkable as a scene "of life than any of the divisions which followed. "That which chiefly distinguished the palæozoic "from the secondary and tertiary periods was "its gorgeous flora. It was emphatically the "period of plants—'of herbs yielding seed after "'their kind.' In no other age did the world "ever witness such a flora; the youth of the "earth was peculiarly a green and umbrageous "youth—a youth of dusk and tangled forests, of "huge pines and stately araucarians, of the reed-"like calamite, the tall tree-fern, the sculptured "sigillaria, and the hirsute lepidodendrons. Wher-"ever dry land, or shallow lakes, or running stream "appeared, from where Melville Island now spreads "out its icy coast under the star of the pole, "to where the arid plains of Australia lie solitary "beneath the bright cross of the south, a rank "and luxuriant herbage cumbered every foot-"breadth of the dank and steaming soil; and even "to distant planets our earth must have shone "through the enveloping cloud with a green and "delicate ray. Of this extraordinary age of plants "we have our cheerful remembrancers and wit-"nesses in the flames that roar in our chimneys "when we pile up the winter fire,—in the brilliant

Digitized by Google

"gas that now casts its light on this great as-
"semblage, and that lightens up the streets and
"lanes of this vast city,—in the glowing furnaces
"that smelt our metals, and give moving power to
"our ponderous engines. . . . . The geologic
"evidence is so complete as to be patent to all
"that the first great period of organized being
"was, as described in the Mosaic record, peculiarly
"a period of herbs and trees, "yielding seed after
"their kind." (*Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 134.)

Now if we admit the general truthfulness of this description, to what would it amount? It would show that the primæval condition of this earth when it first came forth from the hand of its Creator was one of surpassing loveliness. The whole earth flourished and rejoiced. From pole to pole it was covered with a mantle of verdure and beauty. It had no ice-bound regions in which desolation and solitude reigned—no scorched uninhabitable deserts. The creation when finished was *mature* as well as in condition perfect. It did not (as many seem to assume) pass through a stage of infancy and gradual growth, and so, slowly attain maturity. Trees, plants, animals when created were, like man, *mature*. And all, save man, abounded. Food also abounded. Seas, earth, air, were tenanted with life, and creation in all its parts existed in developed perfectness. Such are the inferences to be drawn from the statements of Holy Scripture; and certainly *the*

Digitized by Google

facts affirmed by Hugh Miller do not invalidate such inferences. They rather confirm.

And now let me ask whether there be any thing strange—any thing improbable in the thought that when sin entered, and when creation, once known as the home of perfectness, was appointed to receive the impress of judgment and to bear witness to the reign of death—is there any thing improbable in the thought that the plants, and trees, and flowers, and all the paradisiacal loveliness of the earth should, as to the original form of their perfectness, disappear, and be, for the most part entombed; and that black coal fields should remain as their memorial, to tell us, in charred and mutilated forms, of an excellency of beauty and strength that once was, but has departed — swept away because of human sin? If it was fitting that the home of man's innocency should be marked by all excellency of perfectness and beauty, it is no less fitting that the abode of his banishment—the earth which he has ruined by his transgression, should present him with memorials which he may disinter, and contemplate, and read in them a record of what his sin has wrought. We might well expect that a fallen earth should become the grave of its original perfectness, and *that*, by an act of God's sovereign power as *miraculous*, and probably not more prolonged, than that by which He first gave to it its completeness. It was not indeed a de-

struction of the earth, nor of *all* things in it; but it was a destruction of its primæval *condition*, and a destruction, no doubt, of many things that had distinctively marked that primæval condition.

But to return to the statements of Hugh Miller. He goes on to say, "The middle great period of the "geologist—that of the Secondary division—pos- "sessed, like the earlier one, its herbs and plants, "but they were of a greatly less luxuriant and con- "spicuous character than their predecessors, and no "longer formed the prominent trait or feature of the "creation to which they belonged. The period had "also its corals, its crustaceans, its molluscs, its "fishes, and in some one or two exceptional in- "stances, its dwarf mammals. But the grand exis- "tences of the age,—the existences in which it "excelled every other creation, earlier or later,— "were its huge creeping things,—its enormous "monsters of the deep,—and, as shown by the im- "pressions of their footprints stamped upon the "rocks, its gigantic birds. It was peculiarly the "age of egg-bearing animals, winged and wingless. "Its wonderful *whales*, not, however, as now, of the "mammalian, but of the reptilian class,—ichthyo- "saurs, plesiosaurs, and cetiosaurs,—must have "tempested the deep; its creeping lizards and croco- "diles, such as the teliosaurus, megalosaurus, and "iguanodon,—creatures some of which more than "rivalled the existing elephant in height, and greatly "more than rivalled him in bulk,—must have

Digitized by Google

"crowded the plains, or haunted by myriads the "rivers of the period; and we know that the foot-"prints of at least one of its many birds are of fully "twice the size of those made by the horse or camel. "We are thus prepared to demonstrate, that the "second period of the geologist was peculiarly and "characteristically a period of whale-like reptiles of "the sea, of enormous creeping reptiles of the land "and of numerous birds, some of them of gigantic "size; and, in meet accordance with the fact, we "find that the second Mosaic period with which the "geologist is called on to deal was a period in which "God created the fowl that flieth above the earth, "with moving [or creeping] creatures, both in the "waters and on the land, and what our translation "renders great whales, but that I find rendered in "the margin, great sea-monsters."

"The Tertiary period had also its prominent class "of existences. Its flora seems to have been no "more conspicuous than that of the present time; "its reptiles occupy a very subordinate place; but "its beasts of the field were by far the most wonder-"fully developed, both in size and numbers, that "ever appeared upon earth. Its mammoths and "its mastodons, rhinoceri, and its hippopotami, its "enormous dinotherium and colossal megatherium, "greatly more than equalled in bulk the hugest "mammals of the present time, and vastly exceeded "them in number. The remains of one of its ele-"phants (*Elephas primigenius*) are still so abundant

Digitized by Google

"amid the frozen wastes of Siberia, that what have "been not inappropriately termed 'ivory quarries' "have been wrought among their bones for more "than a hundred years. Even in our own country, "of which, as I have already shown, this elephant "was for long ages a native, so abundant are the "skeletons and tusks, that there is scarcely a local "museum in the kingdom that has not its specimens "dug out of the Pleistocene deposits of the neigh-"bourhood. And with this ancient elephant there "were meetly associated in Britain, as on the "northern continents generally all around the globe, "many other mammals of corresponding magnitude. "'Grand indeed,' says an English naturalist, 'was "the fauna of the British islands in those early days. "Tigers as large again as the biggest Asiatic species, "lurked in the ancient thickets; elephants of nearly "twice the bulk of the largest individuals that now "exist in Africa or Ceylon roamed in herds; at least "two species of rhinoceros forced their way through "the primæval forest; and the lakes and rivers were "tenanted by hippopotami as bulky, and with as "great tusks as those of Africa.' The massive cave-"bear and large cave-hyæna belonged to the same "formidable group, with at least two species of great "oxen (*Bos longifrons* and *Bos primigenius*) with "a horse of smaller size, and an elk (*Megaceros* "*Hibernicus*), that stood ten feet four inches in "height. Truly this Tertiary age—this third and "last of the great geologic periods—was peculiarly

Digitized by Google

"the age of great 'beasts of the earth after their "kind, and of cattle after their kind.'" (Miller, p. 136.)

If again we accept the facts thus detailed (I say the facts, for the conclusions based on them I utterly repudiate as contrary to the Word of God) what would these facts show? They would show that the same Almighty hand that, in judgment, took from the earth the perfectness of its primæval verdure and beauty, did also cause the *animal* world, teeming as it was with life and giant forms of strength, to share in the general ruin. Whilst man unfallen stood in honour and dignity as the head and lord of creation, it was meet that earth, and air, and seas, should abound with living forms of giant might, for the greater the vastness of their strength, the more complete was the attestation to the superior greatness and lordship of man who was set over them all. The vastness of these creatures had in it nothing terrific when first they roamed peacefully and rejoicingly throughout a paradisiacal earth—scorched by no burning heat—withered by no cold. They preyed not one on the other: the green earth supplied them with their food. They threatened not each other; much less did they threaten man. Innocency and peace reigned. There was no need, as afterward (see Luke x. 19), to be guarded against the sting of the scorpion, or the fang of the bear, or any other form of "the power of the enemy," because nothing harmed,—nothing destroyed. There

Digitized by Google

was nothing venomous—nothing that had in it the power of death, for death as yet was not. But when sin, and with it the power of Satan, entered, all was changed. The time allowed to manifest the alteration *might have been* very brief;* but it was no doubt sufficient to evidence among the monsters of the land and of the sea, their change from lamb-like gentleness to satanic cruelty and fury. Fierceness had become the companion of strength: terror of weakness; and fierceness also became armed with power to destroy. What if the earth had remained full of these mighty monsters after their nature had been changed? Would not the earth have become untenable by man? The beasts of the field—"evil beasts," as they are called in Scripture, although reduced in numbers and in strength, became to man

* Respecting this I make no assertion. Whether the results of the Fall in spreading death and destruction were rapidly or more slowly developed throughout the earth—whether *all* traces of the Earth's paradisiacal condition instantaneously disappeared, or were *in measure* preserved till the Flood, and then finally obliterated—whether that ordered record of death which is said to be written on the earth's strata was effected fully at the Fall, or was finally completed when creation was entombed beneath the waters of the Flood—these and such like questions being utterly beyond the scope of human cognisance, cannot be answered. All that we are concerned to maintain is that which Scripture asserts, viz., that death, destruction, and ruin, did not precede, but follow the Fall; and that all that the finger of God may have written on creation as a record of judgment, is *subsequent to* human sin.

Digitized by Google

some of his fiercest and most dreaded enemies. What then would they have been if their giant size and strength, and numbers, had continued what they originally were after they had become possessed of the will and the power to destroy? On every account, therefore, it was to be expected that the hand of almighty power, without indeed making a full end, should yet be stretched out against this part of creation also, and the earth should be made the grave of a greatness for which it was no longer the suited sphere. The same *miraculous* power that in one day had caused the earth to teem with these matured giant forms of life, was equally able in one day (if it so pleased) to cause them to disappear, and to entomb the memorials of them in the rock.

Hugh Miller invites us to enter the geological gallery of the British Museum, and to inspect the organic remains that are consecutively arranged in the successive rooms—the first being devoted to fossil plants chiefly of the Coal Measures. Well, we accept the invitation, and we enter. We hear his statement of the facts, but the comment shall be our own. And our comment is this, "Here we see the record of the ruin of the earth's 'gorgeous flora'—a buried memorial of the strength, and verdure, and beauty, that once characterised an unfallen earth in the day when it 'brought forth grass, and the herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind,'—all created, be it remembered, in maturity,

Digitized by Google

and spreading over the earth from pole to pole, for there were then no blighting consuming influences—no scorching heat—no withering cold—no wasting tempests—no undermining waters—all was peaceful, perfect, and instinct, not with the power of death, but of life. It was the era of man's innocency. But he sins. The scene is suddenly changed. The reign of death begins. God puts forth His almighty power, and by a miracle changes the condition of the earth. He disrobes it of its mantle of beauty. He constitutes these black coal fields as the memorial of the bright living greenness that had been. We gaze on them, and see the record of the ruin that human sin has caused."

We pass on to a second room. We find ourselves still surrounded by memorials of death. We behold the remains of gigantic animals, "all enormous, monstrous, vast," disinterred from the earth's next lowest strata. The hand of God has, so to speak, buried and preserved them separately, that they might be a memorial of the spectacle which the earth on the *fifth* day of its existence presented; when earth and seas from pole to pole teemed with these giant creatures—all harmless—all happy—all ready to own subjection to man. But man sinned; and God miraculously stretched forth His destroying hand, and the earth became well nigh denuded of the mighty creatures that tenanted it; and we see the record of what they were in the fossilized remains before us—another memorial of human sin.

Digitized by Google

We enter the third room, and the same lesson is in another form repeated. Is there anything that should surprise us in all this? Is there anything that does not seem antecedently probable to every mind that owns the power of God as almighty, and recognises that He is able to act secretly as well as miraculously, and believes what the Scripture reveals respecting the consequences of human sin and the reign of death? Indeed, I can see no difficulty in receiving these things. But if, on the contrary, I am asked to believe that the paradisiacal earth which the God of life and love "created," "formed," and "made," and pronounced "very good," was at that moment, down to its very lowest strata, the record of nothing but destruction and death, I repudiate the thought as contrary to every thing that conscience and Scripture teach.

And on what ground am I asked to give my adherence to these theories? On the ground that "IF" we regard the earth's stratification as the result of agencies analogous to those with which experience has elsewhere made us familiar, then myriads of millions of years (we might as well say at once an eternity) would be required to produce the phenomena. But that *IF* involves the whole question. I refuse to grant the hypothesis. I refuse to allow it to be assumed that God did not act *miraculously* when the earth's strata were made, as to every essential characteristic, what we

Digitized by Google

now find them to be. I ask for demonstrative proof that God did not act *miraculously* when He smote creation at the Fall. I ask for demonstrative proof that He has not acted *miraculously since*, in convulsing and upheaving the earth's crust, as at the time when He brake up the fountains of the great deep at the time of the Flood, and as at the time when He descended on Sinai and shook the whole earth. If God, at the time when He miraculously smote creation, was pleased to appoint that the memorials of creation's ruin should be presented in a certain order and arrangement analogous to that which He adopted in presenting the original order of life, and if subsequently, still acting miraculously (as when He descended at Sinai, and at the Flood) He has by means unknown to us, disturbed and convulsed the earth's crust, I find in such operations of the Divine hand, a sufficient cause for every appearance, whether of order, or disorder, that the earth's strata present. I can understand why remains that, according to the order of arrangement, should belong to the lowest strata, should be found in the highest, and the reverse. If, after the earth was stricken at the Fall, it had become the abode of humility, contrition, and obedience, the case would have been different: but instead thereof, it became the abode of violence, rebellion, and sin. What wonder then that God should have shaken it to its very foundations as He did at Sinai, and as He will yet

Digitized by Google

again shake it, in token that He recogniseth it as the habitation, not only of fallen, but of unhumbled, rebellious man.

I wish it to be observed that in saying these things I pretend to no geologic learning—I have none; nor do I profess to propose any theory that will satisfactorily account for all geologic facts, or meet every difficulty that might be, whether reasonably or captiously, urged. What I say is this. I maintain that all that Scripture has revealed, directly or indirectly, concerning the physical condition of this earth, both in its paradisiacal and its fallen state, is to be tenaciously held. Having once ascertained that Scripture does reveal certain things as true, those things we must hold as infallibly certain, and even if an angel from Heaven were to gainsay them we heed him not. If any supposed facts, the result of human research, are presented to us, we should be willing to examine and try them by the Scripture. If they bear the test—especially if they manifestly tend to corroborate or illustrate Scripture, we welcome them. If they do not bear that test, we shall certainly find, sooner or later, either that we have hastily assumed as a fact that which is not a fact; or that we have been comparing with the Scripture, not a fact, but our deductions from, or reasonings about, a fact.

I am not here concerned to enquire into the arguments that may be urged either for or against

Digitized by Google

the facts advanced by Hugh Miller. If we assume them to be, even in a general sense, true—if we admit that the fossilized remains in the earth's strata present an order of destruction closely resembling the order of creation on the third, fifth, and sixth days, as detailed in Genesis—if the work of the third day in clothing the earth with verdure and beauty, has its memorial in the stricken and mutilated remains of trees and forests that lie entombed beneath our feet; and if the works of the fifth and sixth days are also recorded by corresponding remains of ruin, I accept the attestation that such records furnish to the great truth, that the earth, once free from all corruption and all power of death, has, because of human sin, been made likewise to witness to the power of that hand which is able not only to bless, but also to destroy.

If it be contended that the remains found in the earth's strata are not only the result of distinct acts of destruction, (which may be true) but that they belong to periods infinitely distinct in time, I reply that such a statement can have no weight with those who receive the Scripture. It is really the same kind of argument as is used to shew the days of creation were separated periods of undetermined extent. Moreover, such a statement belongs to a theory whose conclusions it is impossible to accept; first, because they rest on an insufficient induction of facts; and secondly, because

Digitized by Google

the premise which is the very pillar of their system, will be found, on examination, to rest on mere assumption, and not on fact.

First, as regards insufficient induction. All present geologic theories recognise no distinction between the condition of the paradisiacal, and the unparadisiacal earth: they ignore the consequences of the Fall—they forget that the trees, plants, and animals, which spread over the earth at first, were created, not in an imperfect, but in a mature condition; and they assign no place for the *miraculous* operation of the hand of God, at the Fall, and since the Fall, in altering the condition of the creation. Any theory that omits these all-important facts must be worthless.

Secondly, as regards unwarranted assumption—what shadow of proof can be adduced to shew that the operation of slowly working physical agencies (and not miraculous power) either formed the earth's strata, or brought them into the condition in which we now find them to be? I ask for proof—clear, definite proof that the agencies asserted to have produced such and such phenomena ever existed. I ask for proof that the phenomena ever were, or could be, produced by any such gradual agencies as experience has made us acquainted with: but I find no answer to my demand. No proof is furnished me. On the contrary, I find the theories proposed to me to be based on the merest speculative assumption. Am

Digitized by Google

I not more than justified in saying this, when I read such a statement as the following?

" That small pencil of solar radiation which is " arrested by our planet, and which constitutes less " than the 2,000-millionth part of the total energy " sent forth from the sun, must be regarded as the " power which enabled the plants of the carboni- " ferous period to wrest the carbon they required " from the oxygen with which it was combined, " and eventually to deposit it as the solid material " of coal. In our day, the reunion of that carbon " with oxygen restores the energy expended in the " former process, and thus we are enabled to utilise " the power originally derived from the luminous " centre of our planetary system. But the agency " of the sun in originating coal does not stop at " this point. In every period of geological history " the waters of the ocean have been lifted by the " action of the sun and precipitated in rain upon " the earth. This has given rise to all those sedi- " mentary actions by which mineral substances " have been collected at particular localities, and " there deposited in a stratified form with a protect- " ing cover to preserve them for future use. The " phase of the earth's existence suitable for the ex- " tensive formation of coal appears to have passed " away for ever." (Extract from speech of Sir W. Armstrong at meeting of British Association, August 26th, 1863.)

Now I ask any unprejudiced person to say

Digitized by Google

whether there is the slightest evidence *to prove* that metal deposits, and coal, were produced in the way supposed? If they ever were so produced, is it not evident that we should find a similar process in some form or other being continued still, especially, when geologists assert that in the earliest of their pretended pre-Adamic ages, the atmosphere and the respiratory organs of animals were in every material respect the same as now? But we find no coal-fields growing around us now. Unfortunately for his theory, Sir William Armstrong is obliged to acknowledge that "the phase of the earth's existence suitable for the extensive formation of coal appears to have passed away for ever." Yes: but when did it exist? Is it indeed asked of me that I should believe that all the vast coal-fields that are now being laid bare, and found to be filled with memorials of a destruction suddenly brought on a fair creation, are the results of the slow mingling of light with certain carbon supplied by plants? If we be willing to lend our credulous ear to such fables—if on the assumption that fabulous, imaginary agencies like these, have produced the phenomena of creation, and that because such agencies must be slow, therefore, an antiquity of countless ages must be assigned to a globe whose existence has not yet measured 6000 years—if, I say, we so thoroughly despise the Word of God as to be willing to allow baseless speculations like these to weigh in the balance more heavily than its Divine

Digitized by Google

testimonies, I know not what we can expect, save finally to be counted among those adversaries who shall, by and by, "wonder and perish."

Whenever geologists are able to declare with precision the exact condition and constitution of the paradisiacal earth—when they are able to tell the mode, extent, and results of the change in the earth's condition at the fall of man when creation was first subjected to the bondage of corruption—when they can describe the manner of the formation of Sh'ohl (Hades) within the earth's bowels, and the effects thereby produced on the earth's surface—when they can tell me what is meant in Scripture by Hades "enlarging herself" (See Is. v. 14) and all the effects of such enlargement—when they can tell me whether the axis of the earth was at its creation, inclined, as now, to its orbit; and if not, when the inclination took place, and the effects thereby produced — when they can declare the character and results of all the convulsions that have visited this earth *since the fall*, especially at the time when God descended on Sinai and shook the whole earth in a manner comparable to that last great shaking which is yet to be—when they can explain to me the manner and extent of the change that has passed on animals now known as carnivorous, but which once ate the herb of the field (see Gen. i. 30), and which, in time yet to come, shall again feed thereon (Is. xi. 7) —when they can tell me whether the moon (whose

Digitized by Google

light in the coming millennial age will be as the light of the sun) and whether the sun (whose light in that coming age will be sevenfold augmented, (see Is. xxx. 26) had a similar or greater brilliancy and heat in the paradisiacal period, and what were the consequences as to climate, &c., of such heat and brilliancy — when they can tell me whether the physical laws affecting the distribution of heat and cold, the formation of strata, the growth and multiplication of plants and animals, the corrosion of rocks, &c., &c., were the same in the antediluvian age (when man's longevity was so great) as now— when they can declare on what occasions and in what manner God has employed *miraculous* agency in the arrangement or disarrangement of the earth's strata — when they can declare all that He may thus have done, secretly and without the cognisance of man, at the time of the Fall, and at the Flood, and at the descent on Sinai—when these, and other like questions have been satisfactorily answered, then we may admit that geologists are competent to account for, and to form theories on their facts. But till that time comes (and it never will come to uninspired man) the acceptance of conclusions which require for their establishment the possession of Divine wisdom, would be unpardonable fatuity, even if such conclusions did not expressly contradict the Scripture. But what shall we say when we find that these conclusions are at utter variance with Holy Writ, and necessitate by their

Digitized by Google

reception the rejection of the Word of the living God?

And will not the candour of *some* geologists admit that they have found it not easy to reconcile some of their avowed facts with the theories they have adopted respecting various successive pre-Adamic epochs? If the earth has many times existed as a place of developed life, and has been many times destroyed and renewed, we might certainly expect that these periods (separated, it is said, by countless ages from each other) would be marked as different by the plants, animals, &c., found in different epochs being organically contrasted in their constitution, etc., from each other. We should not have expected to find similarity in the organism of the creatures found in these different creations. Yet it is admitted that there is similarity. What then would such similarity indicate? Would it not tend to show that things that had such similarity must have belonged to the same one creation? We find no difficulty if we think of them in connection with an earth once created in perfectness, and then suddenly smitten. In the very earliest epoch which geologists have imagined, they find to their surprise, that animals had the same organs of respiration as now—that the composition of the atmosphere must have been nearly the same as at present, and that there has been no progressive improvement (as some have

Digitized by Google

falsely asserted) in animal organization.* The fact too that *some* (though but a few) of the fossilized species are found scattered throughout all the supposed periods, would in itself be a strong argument to prove the identity of those periods.† If God was pleased to bring a sudden stroke of ruin on the

* "All these circumstances lead, therefore, to the conclusion that the external conditions in which animals exist have undergone no essential change since the Palæozoic age, inasmuch as the organs of respiration have remained the same a conclusion which is still further confirmed when, descending from the orders, the genera are examined." *Lardner*, § 544.

"We arrive, therefore, at the conclusion, as well for terrestrial animals, which breathe by trachea, as for marine animals, that the respiratory organs have not undergone any progressive improvement, and that this class in the cradle of nature was what it still is; in fine, that the medium of its terrestrial existence has always been the same, since the first animalisation of the globe to the present time." *Ibid.* § 546.

"It must, therefore, be inferred, that at these remote epochs, the medium in which birds and reptiles breathing the air by lungs lived, was little if at all different from the medium in which similar classes now live, which leads to the conclusion that, at this early period in the history of the globe, the composition of the atmosphere must have been nearly the same as at present." *Ibid.* 548.

† See Lardner, § 249. Hitchcock says, "All the great classes of organic beings, vegetable and animal, are found nearly at the earliest epoch, and continue through the entire series of rocks" (p. 225). And again, p. 143, "The different rocks that lie above one another do, indeed, contain some species that are common; but the most are peculiar."

Digitized by Google

creation that He had made—if He designed that the greatness and fairness of that creation in its pristine condition should be attested by forms of death entombed within the earth's crust, is it not to be expected that He would establish a certain order and regularity of arrangement in the distribution of these buried forms, bearing witness of the power of death, just as before there had been a certain regularity and order in the mode of His creating them for life? If He has separated, so to speak, the picture of death into many divisions, it is that we might the more easily contemplate it in detail, whilst, at the same time, He has shown by His distribution of a few fossilized remains of like species through each division, that these divisions are not to be regarded as indicating distinct creations. And how monstrous the supposition, that, for countless myriads of ages, the earth should have existed teeming with life, and clothed with verdure and beauty, without any rational creature being found thereon capable of enjoying it, and of owning and worshipping the Creator! That there could have been no rational being there is manifest, for the rational creation is distributed into two classes only, angels and men. Angels have Heaven as their home. No one can suppose that they could have dwelt in any earth—especially in an earth that was to be destroyed. That no human being could have been there is certain, for Adam is expressly declared to have been "the *first* man." "The first man is of

Digitized by Google

the earth, earthy." (1. Cor. xv.) To suppose, then, that there could have been an earth unoccupied and unpresided over, is impossible. And is it not an equally monstrous supposition that the formation and arrangements of the earth's strata should be regarded as the result of the operation of slow ordinary physical agencies, such as those we now see around us, and not the result of miraculous almighty power? "To the question," says Dr. Lardner, "as to the lapse of time during which these successive sedimentary strata have been formed, it is impossible to give any answer even as definite as the estimates of their thickness. All that can be said is, that the deposition from turbid waters being generally a slow process, *it may be imagined* [the italics are mine] that intervals of time of vast duration must have been required for the formation of strata which measure many miles in thickness." (*Lardner's Popular Geology*, p. 53.)

It is very certain that if we once begin to *imagine* the mode of God's operations in making creation what it is, our conclusions will be the offspring of our imagination, and will have that value, and nothing more. If instead of "*imagining*" agencies which never could have been employed (for they are incapable of producing the results before us) we admit the miraculous and unsearchable operation of the Divine hand, we may, no doubt, still find difficulties in explaining and accounting for all the phenomena presented to our view, but we shall find

nothing in that to shock or disappoint us; for having admitted that His ways are unsearchable, we should be surprised if we found them searchable. No—they are not searchable, though by and by they will be; when the redeemed shall be endued with other powers, and shall know even as they are known. For that hour we wait; in the meanwhile being very sure, because His Word declares it, that this creation is *one* creation, created in six literal days as Genesis records, and afterward smitten—subjected to vanity—to groaning—to the reign of death; and the attestations to that reign of death which we find entombed within the earth's crust, we ascribe to the unsearchable operation of that almighty power which is not accustomed, when acting on occasions that affect the universe, to work by ordinary methods, but to perform its acts in a manner untraceable by man, and worthy of the glorious power of Him who needs no time for the fulfilment of His plans. He is able to condense into a *moment* operations that might be extended over millions and tens of millions of years. "He speaketh, and it is done: He commandeth, and it standeth fast."

Digitized by Google

Note on the Locality of Hades.

I SCARCELY need observe that the belief that *Hades** (Hebrew *Sh'ohl*) was a *subterranean* place in which the souls of the departed were, was prevalent both among the ancient heathen philosophers, and the Jews. See Josephus as quoted below.†

* It must be remembered that Hades is not *Gehenna*. Gehenna (a name derived from the place where carcases and corrupt things were burned without the walls of Jerusalem) is a name applied by our Lord to the *eternal* place of torment—a place which as being eternal must exist apart from the earth which is to pass away. Gehenna is no doubt identical with "the lake of fire" into which the wicked are to be cast after the last judgment. The places in which Gehenna is used are Matt. v. 22 : v. 29 : v. 30 : x. 28 : xviii. 9 : xxiii. 15 : xxiii. 33. —Mark ix. 43 : ix. 45 : ix. 47 : Luke xii. 5 : James iii. 6.— *Hades* is the word used in all other places where "*Hell*" occurs in our English New Testament.

† The Sadducees did not believe in the existence of rewards and punishments in another world. Josephus, speaking of them, says,—*τας καθ' Αἰδου τιμωριας και τιμας αναιρουσι* : but that the Pharisees on the contrary acknowledged both, and regarded Hades as being *subterranean*—*αθανατον τε ισχυν ταις ψυχαις πιστις αυτοις ειναι, και ὑπο χθονος δικαιωσεις τε και τιμας.* Therefore the Jews which thought the souls immortal, did believe that the Just were rewarded, as well as the Unjust punished, *ὑπο χθονος* or *καθ' ᾅδου*. (*See Pearson, Creed*, Art. v.) Josephus too speaks of the soul of Samuel being brought up

Digitized by Google

Among the Fathers the belief was not less prevalent. Tertullian expressly maintains that the *Inferi* are within the earth, and that the souls of the departed went there: so did the soul of Christ, of whom he says, "that He did not ascend into the higher heavens until He had first descended *into the earth's lower parts*" (nec ante ascendit in sublimiora cælorum quam descendit in inferiora terrarum): and again, "you have to believe that the region of the Inferi is subterranean," (habes et regionem Inferûm subterraneam credere).* So also Euthymius†: "Hades is a place under the earth apportioned off to the souls of the dead." (*τοπος γαρ ὁ ᾅδης ὑπο γην αποκεκληρωμενος ταις των αποθνησκοντων ψυχαις.*) So Leporius‡ gives "the lower parts of the earth" (inferiores partes terra) as the explanation of "*Inferna*," into which, he says, Christ descended. Indeed even heretics such as the Arians allowed it, for in the Creed made at Sirmium and produced at Ariminum, we find the words, "who was crucified, suffered,

---

from Hades: Saul, he says, directed the woman—*την Σάμουηλου ψυχην αναγαγειν αυτῳ· ἡ δ'αγνοουσα τον Σαμουηλον ὁστις ην, καλει τουτον ἐξ ᾅδου·* (Joseph. *Antiq. Jud.* vi. 14.) It was true indeed that Samuel came: but the woman, by her powers, did not bring him up: God to her terror and amazement sent him. (See note on p. 115.)

* Tertullian, as quoted by Bishop Pearson on Creed, Art. v., p. 237, folio.

† Euthymius as quoted by Pearson. Art. v.

‡ Leporius as quoted by Pearson. Art. v.

Digitized by Google

died, and descended into the subterranean places," (*σταυρωθεντα και παθοντα και αποθανοντα και εις τα καταχθονια κατελθοντα*)—words which Bishop Pearson shows must, in *their* use of them, have referred, not to the burial of the body of Christ, but to the descent of His soul into Hades.

Referring to the text in the Ephesians—"now in that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" Bishop Pearson observes; "This many of the ancient Fathers understood of the descent into Hades *as placed in the lowest parts of the earth;* and this exposition must be confessed so probable that there can be no argument to disprove it." (Pearson, Art. v. p. 226 folio.) Pearson subjoins the following note: "This" (*i.e.* the manner in which the words in the Ephesians were understood by the Fathers) "appeareth by their quotation of this place to prove or express the descent into Hades as Irenæus does." Book v. ch. 31. folio. [The words of Irenæus are "Dominus legem mortuorum servavit ut fieret primogenitus a mortuis, et commoratus usque ad tertiam diem *in inferioribus terræ*"—"the Lord conformed to the law of the dead, that he might be the first-born from the dead, and tarried until the third day *in the lower parts of the earth.*"] So also Origen Hom. 35 in Matt.—Athanasius Epis. ad Epictetum—Hilarius in Ps. 67. "Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit." (Jerome in locum.)

Digitized by Google

Now it is indeed quite true that no value whatever is to be attached to the opinions of men on this or any kindred subjects unless they can be sustained by Holy Scripture—the one only test of Truth. Nor do I here refer to other *erroneous* thoughts which many of the Fathers had respecting Hades, such for example as its being the place to which the souls of the righteous *now* go at death: I am referring simply to their opinion as to the *locality* of Hades. Is then that opinion in conformity with the Word of God? The Scripture in very many passages speaks of Hades or Sh'ohl in such a way as decidedly to sanction the belief that prevailed even in the heathen world respecting its being *beneath* us—*beneath our feet* in whatsoever part of the earth men may be supposed to stand. Thus in that remarkable passage, the death of Korah and his company in Numbers xvi. 29. "If these men die the common death of all men, or if they be visited after the visitation of all men; then the Lord hath not sent me. But if the Lord make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up, with all that appertain unto them, and they *go down quick into Sh'ohl* (Hades); then ye shall understand that these men have provoked the Lord. And it came to pass, as he had made an end of speaking all these words, that the ground clave asunder that was under them: and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their

Digitized by Google

goods. They, and all that appertained to them, *went down alive into Sh'ohl*, (Hades) and the earth closed upon them."

In Job we find the expression, "*going down*" into Sh'ohl, frequently occurring. Thus Job vii. 9, "he that *goeth down* to Sh'ohl:" and xvii. 16, "They shall *go down* to the bars of Sh'ohl:" and xxi. 13, "in a moment *go down* to Sh'ohl:" and Ps. lv. 15, "let them *go down* quick into Sh'ohl." And Is. xiv. 9, "Sh'ohl *from beneath* is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming:" and xiv. 11, "thy pomp is *brought down* to Sh'ohl." And Amos ix. 2, "though *they dig* into Sh'ohl." There are an abundance of such passages—all showing the position which Sh'ohl or Hades holds in relation to man standing *on* the earth. It is always spoken of as *beneath* us and *in* the earth. Else we should not find the expression "*dig into*" it.

In Psalm lxiii. 9, we find the words, "they shall go into the lower parts of the earth." Now as this is said in reference to the wicked *whilst on the earth*, it is evident that it cannot be understood of them except as removed from the earth's surface into another part of the earth below; and accordingly, this passage has been continually referred to by the Fathers and others, as bearing out the interpretation already given of the words in the Ephesians, "what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of the earth."*

* On this passage Dean Alford observes—"Nor can it be

Digitized by Google

In the New Testament, Phil. ii. 10, we find a remarkable expression strongly corroborative of all that has been said, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things *under the earth*" (*επουρανιων, επιγειων, καταχθονιων*). This is a very important passage. It evidently speaks not of things inanimate or unintelligent, but of beings capable of bowing the knee intelligently; and it expressly teaches not only that all intelligent beings on the earth, but that all intelligent beings in subterranean places,* shall finally be made to bow; the latter, indeed, not bowing the knee of allegiance, or of worship, but of forced unwilling acknowledgment.

---

said that the descent into hell [Hades] would be irrelevant here, or that our Lord ascended not from Hades but from the earth: for the fact of descent being the primary thought, we have only to ask as above, how far that descent is carried in the Apostle's mind. The greater the descent the greater the ascent. . . . . this ascent what does it imply but a descent, and that, even to the lower parts of the earth from which the spoils of victory were fetched? And this meaning seems to be upheld by the *ινα πληρωση τα παντα* which follows, as well as by the contrast furnished by *υπερανω παντων των ουρανων*—'high above all heavens.' This interpretation is upheld by most of the ancients." (*Alford in locum.*)

* *Καταχθονιοι* is not the same expression as *υποκατω της γης* which last in Rev. v. is used of creatures under the surface of the ground. *Καταχθονιοι* is evidently equivalent to the Latin "*inferi.*" It is translated by Wyckliffe, "hellis," *i.e.* beings in Hades; and by the Rheimish version, "*infernals*," following the Vulgate *infernorum.*

Digitized by Google

I scarcely see how we could refuse to admit on the evidence of this passage alone, that the interior parts of the earth are at present the prison of certain souls—the souls of the lost. Bishop Ellicott commenting on this passage says, "The three classes here mentioned are not to be understood with any ethical reference . . . . . but simply and plainly, angels and archangels in Heaven—men upon earth—and the departed under the earth." He also refers to Theodoret, whose words are, *επουρανιους τας αορατους δυναμεις. επιγειους δε τους ετι ζωντας ανθρωπους; και καταχθονιους τους τεθνεωτας.* (*Theodoret in locum.*)

Another strong evidence of the connexion of Hades with the earth is this, that when this Adamic earth is destroyed at the close of the millennium, when the new heavens and earth are created, then Hades is destroyed likewise. It is seen cast into the lake of fire. See Rev. xx.

As then the grave is regarded in Scripture as the prison-house of the body, so Hades is regarded as the prison-house of the dis-embodied soul; evidencing, consequently, the power of death. In order, therefore, to prove the completeness of His submission to the real power of death, and in fulfilment of His own words respecting His being three days and three nights *in the heart* of the earth, the soul of our blessed Lord was in Hades during the time that His body was in the grave. The text from the Psalms quoted by Peter in the Acts, "Thou

Digitized by Google

wilt not leave my soul in Hades," unquestionably proves this.* The same truth is likewise taught

* "In death the soul doth certainly pass by a real motion from that place in which it did inform the body, and is translated to that place and unto that society which God of His mercy or justice hath allotted to it. And not at present to enquire into the difference and distance of those several habitations (but for method's sake to involve them all as yet under the notion of the infernal parts, or the mansions below) it will appear to have been the general judgment of the Church that the soul of Christ contradistinguished from His body, that better and more noble part of His humanity, His rational and intellectual soul, after a true and proper separation from His flesh, was really and truly carried into those parts below, where the souls of men before departed were detained: and that by such a real translation of His soul, He was truly said to have descended into Hell" (Hades).

"Many have been the interpretations of the opinions of the Fathers made of late; and their differences made to appear so great as if they agreed in nothing which concerns this point: whereas there is nothing which they agree in more than this which I have already affirmed, the real descent of the soul of Christ into the habitation of the souls departed. The persons to whom, and the end for which He descended, they differ in, but as to a local descent into the infernal parts they all agree. Who were in those parts they could not certainly define, but whosoever were there, that Christ by the presence of His soul was with them, they all determined." (*Pearson on Creed*, p. 236.)

It should, however, be added, that many of the Fathers by their want of apprehending the perfectness of a believer's justification, and by their mingling another question which is perfectly distinct (viz., the meaning of 1. Peter iii. 19) with the present question respecting the place of the disembodied

Digitized by Google

in His words just quoted respecting His being "in the heart of the earth,"—for, "*heart of the earth*" is not an expression that the Lord would apply *only* to the sepulchre in which His body was laid. If He had intended to refer only to the grave, He would no doubt have made especial reference to His body, saying, "the body of the Son of Man shall be three days in the earth;" whereas, His words are not so limited. "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights *in the heart* of the earth" (Matt. xii. 10)—words which cannot be understood so as to exclude reference to His soul, with which consciousness and feeling remained.

Whilst then the Scripture plainly declares that the soul of our Lord was in Hades during the time that His body was in the grave, it is equally evident that that part of Hades in which His blessed and holy soul was, was not a place of torment, or of suffering. On the contrary, though it was a place

---

soul of Christ during the three days that His body was in the grave, have introduced difficulties which do not properly belong to the subject; and have by many rash and unscriptural statements laid the foundation for the accursed doctrines that have since been promulgated respecting Purgatory—doctrines which, if true, would destroy all that Christ has taught respecting salvation.

That Hades is not the grave is manifest from this, that it is continually spoken of in Scripture as a place of consciousness; which the grave is not.

Digitized by Google

of confinement bearing witness to the power of death, even as the grave is a place of confinement bearing witness to the power of death, yet to the soul of Jesus it was a place of rest, and peace, and communion with God. All the penal suffering that had to be borne for us by our great Substitute terminated at the Cross when He bowed His head and said, "It is finished." Then the cup of suffering that He had to drink for His people was drained to the dregs; and all after it was peace, rest, and triumph. He soon proved that the gates of Hades had no strength to resist the mighty power of Him, whose soul, for a season, was enclosed within its bars.

Nor is the fact of the soul of our blessed Lord having been three days in Hades, the only reason that we have for affirming that there was one part of Hades separated off from the rest, and allotted to the righteous.

In the parable of our Lord concerning the rich man and Lazarus, it is very evident that Abraham and Lazarus were in a state of blessedness, for it is expressly said that Lazarus was "comforted;" but Abraham and Lazarus are not spoken of as being *in Heaven.* On the contrary, they are spoken of as being separated by a vast and impassable chasm (*χασμα μεγα εστηρικται*) from the place in which the rich man was; and *he* is expressly said to have been *in Hades* in torment. Would the Lord have spoken this parable if there had not

Digitized by Google

been (I do not say now *is*) in Hades a place of blessedness as well as a place of torment? That the expectation of the Old Testament saints was to go to Hades (Sh'ohl) is manifest from the words of Jacob when he mourned for the supposed death of Joseph. "All his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him; but he refused to be comforted; and he said, For I will go down to Sh'ohl unto my son mourning." (Gen. xxxvii. 35.) And again, "then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to Sh'ohl." (Gen. xlii. 38.)* Yet in expecting to go into Hades they must have regarded it as a place (not to them of sorrow or torment) but of rest and blessedness: otherwise they could not have

* See also Gen. xliv. 29 and 31, where Judah twice repeats to Joseph the words of Jacob—"Ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to Sh'ohl" (Hades). See also 1 Sam. ii. 6, "He bringeth down to Sh'ohl and bringeth up:" and Ps. xxx. 3, "Thou hast brought up my soul from Sh'ohl:" and Ps. xlix. 15, "But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sh'ohl:" and Ps. lxxxviii. 48, "Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of Sh'ohl." When Samuel too was raised and appeared to Saul, he speaks of himself as brought up or caused to arise. "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?"—and the woman describes what she saw as the appearance of "gods ascending *out of the earth*." The woman had evidently designed to deceive Saul by causing a spirit to *personate* Samuel, for she had no power over Samuel, or over any of the dead: but instead of the spirit, whom she expected, appearing, God, to her terror and amazement, sent Samuel himself.

Digitized by Google

died, as they did die, in peace. They regarded it too, as a temporary state in which their souls were to wait only for a season, for "they looked for a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." I do not see, therefore, how we can avoid accepting the conclusion, that there was in Hades a division prepared for the souls of the blessed, and another division called "the lowest Hades" (Deut. xxxii. 22) assigned to the souls of the lost; and that the souls of those who died in the faith of a *promised* Saviour did, until the resurrection and ascension of that Saviour, remain in that division of Hades that was allotted to the souls of the blessed, being there sustained and comforted by the power of God, and proving the words of the Psalmist, "if I make my bed in Sh'ohl, behold thou [Jehovah] art there." (Ps. cxxxix. 8.)*

Since, however, the ascension of our Lord into His glory, it is very evident that the souls of all believers at death depart to be with Him in Paradise: and that Paradise is not Hades (as some of the Fathers thought) is evident from this,

* Jerome on the third chapter of Ecclesiastes, says: "Ante adventum Christi omnia ad Inferos pariter ducebantur, unde et Jacob ad Inferos pariter descensurum se dicit; et Job pios et impios in Inferno queritur retentari: et Evangelium, 'Chaos magnum interpositum apud Inferos.'" In another place he says, "Unde et Abraham, licet in loco refrigerii, tamen apud inferos, cum Lazaro, fuisse scribitur."

Google

that St. Paul speaks of Paradise as the third heavens.* Compare second and fourth verses of 2 Cor. xii. Nor did St. Paul speak of Hades,

* The notion that Paradise was in Hades, seems to have arisen in part from a misunderstanding of the words of our Lord to the repentant thief, "Verily, I say unto thee, this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Our Lord, as being God, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, had a title to speak of Himself as being in Paradise, even whilst His body was in the grave, and His soul in Hades. When on earth He spake of Himself as the Son of Man, ὁ ὢν (the Being One) in heaven. On this ground He might speak of the thief being with Him in Paradise, even during the time His body was in the grave.

There would be no difficulty, therefore, in the statement, even if we follow the usual pointing of the passage and regard "*this day*" as attached to the latter clause. But if we read the passage thus: "Verily I say unto thee this day, thou shalt be with me in Paradise," all shadow of difficulty is removed. The thief had asked that the Lord would remember him for blessing when He came in His Kingdom. The Lord replied that he would not postpone His blessing to that future hour, but that He would bless him *then*—that He would pronounce the authoritative sentence of blessing upon him, even on that present day whilst He was yet hanging on the Cross. "Verily I say unto thee this day" (*i. e.* I wait not till I come in my kingdom, but I say to thee this present day) "Thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Whichever of these interpretations be followed, it is evident that the passage affords no warrant for identifying Paradise and Hades. "Si paradisum accipiamus Regnum æternæ beatitudinis, aptius erit ut ita distinguamus, *Amen dico tibi hodie*, atque hic posito hypostigmate, subjiciatur, *mecum* eris in Paradiso." (Zeger. *Critici Sacri.*)

Digitized by Google

when he said, "to depart and be with Christ (*συν Χριστῳ*) is far better;" nor when he spoke of absence from the body being presence with the Lord. (2 Cor. v. 8.) These texts put it beyond a question that the souls of believers do not now go to Hades, but are with their Lord in Heaven, awaiting the resurrection hour.

Nor can there be any doubt that the souls of the saints of the Old Testament are also in Heaven. The Apostle in speaking of the one family of faith, speaks of it as divided into two parts only; namely, those still militant on earth, and those who are in the Heavens. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom *the whole family** in heaven and on earth (*εν ουρανοις και επι γης*) is named." Eph. iii. 14. He would not thus have written if part of that family had still been *καταχθονιοι* in Hades.

Nor is there any reason to doubt that when the Apostle, speaking of the Ascension of the Lord, says, "When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive," he did by these words refer to the Lord taking with Him into Heaven, as an evidence of His triumph over Hades, the souls of all His saints who had till that time been there detained; thus proving that He had the keys of

* For proof that "whole family" is the correct translation, see *Remarks on Revised Translation of New Testament*, as advertised at end.

Digitized by Google

Hades. Soon He will equally prove by raising their bodies from the grave, that He has the keys of death likewise—death being more especially connected with the grave, seeing that *there* its power is peculiarly shown in the dissolution and corruption of the body.*

I have already observed that the text in 1 Pet. iii. 19 (on the interpretation of which I will not at present enter †) has no reference to the question of Hades being the place where the soul of our blessed Lord was during the time that His body

* Bishop Pearson observes: "Of those (of the Fathers) which did believe the name of Hades to belong to that general place which comprehended all the souls of men (as well those which died in the favour of God as those which departed in their sins) some of them thought that Christ descended to that place of Hades where the souls of the faithful from the death of righteous Abel to the death of Christ were detained; and there dissolving all the power by which they were detained below, translated them into a far more glorious place and estated them in a condition far more happy in the heavens above." Thus Cyril Catech. iv. "He descended into the *subterranean* places that thence he might liberate the righteous" (*κατηλθεν εις τα καταχθονια, ινα κακειθεν λυτρωσηται τους δικαιους*). Augustine also refused to pronounce the opinion absurd. Si enim non absurdè credi videtur, antiquos etiam Sanctos qui venturi Christi tenuerunt fidem, *locis quidem a tormentis impiorum remotissimis*, sed apud Inferos, fuisse, donec eos inde sanguis Christi ad ea loca descensus erueret, &c. (*De Civ. Dei*, l. xx. c. 15.)

† I would only observe that *κηρυσσειν* does not mean "*to preach the Gospel*," unless the words *το ευαγγελιον* be added, or implied in the context. It means "*to make proclamation*."

Digitized by Google

was in the grave. No one who understands the completeness of His sacrificial work upon the Cross will for a moment believe that His soul endured any suffering afterwards; or that Hades could, either in His case, or in the case of any of His ransomed saints, be any other than a place of blessedness. To say, on any pretext whatsoever, that any thing except blessedness could by any possibility pertain to the justified after death, is to overthrow all that Scripture teaches us respecting Christ's salvation.

My present object, however, in touching on this subject is not to discuss it in all its many branches, but merely to show that as we have to connect locality with Heaven, so we have to connect locality with Hades, and that it is *καταχθονιον* — *subterranean.* And seeing that Hades, even in its relation to Christ and to His people, was, like the grave, a witness to the temporary triumph of death; and that another part of Hades was, and still is, a place of penal suffering to the lost, I maintain that no such place existed when the earth was at first created in its paradisiacal state of perfectness, and when everything that God had made was pronounced "very good." And finding that geological theories omit all reference to the formation of Hades, and to all the consequences that must have flowed therefrom, I do, on this ground alone, decline to receive conclusions which are based upon an induction of facts so manifestly imperfect.

Digitized by Google

Supplementary Remarks.

I WOULD now appeal to those who fear God and venerate His Word, and ask them whether they are satisfied with the manner in which the statements of Scripture respecting creation are being (well nigh universally) either evaded, or repudiated. The strict truthfulness of the Word of God is, either tacitly or avowedly impugned. Yet the Scripture unequivocally asserts its own truthfulness. It must therefore be rejected as false, if it be not in every thing truthful.

In Exodus xx. 9-11 we find these words—words which God's own lips uttered, and which His own fingers wrote upon tables of stone. "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it."

Few, I suppose, will deny that the sabbath day has in all generations been regarded as a literal

Digitized by Google

day. Men have never dreamed of keeping a sabbath of unlimited extent: nor would such observance be possible. If then the sabbath day be a literal day, are we to be asked to believe that the six preceding days, associated with it in an avowedly consecutive enumeration, *are not* literal days, but periods of unlimited and indefinite extent? What *certain* knowledge could be conveyed by language, if in the consecutive enumeration of things professedly like in kind, a change (without warning or explanation) were permitted to be introduced, whereby one portion of the series would be made to bear a meaning essentially different from that which attaches to the other? A period of a thousand, or it may be, ten thousand years, is something very different from a period of twenty-four hours. If God had taken a longer time than six days to make what He made, would He not have told us so? Would He have said that the sabbath day was a seventh part of the time that elapsed between it and the commencement of creation? Yet, unless words are to be divested of their meaning, this is that which He *has* said. That men in former ages have accepted the literal meaning of these words, is proved by their division of years into weeks of seven days, and by the observance, in Israel and in Christendom, of a sabbath day of twenty-four hours' duration. Now, however, we are living in days when non-natural interpretation is deemed rather a merit than a sin, because men are weary of the restraint that Scripture imposes on

Digitized by Google

their lawlessness both of thought and action. They say our thoughts and our tongues are our own: who is lord over us? Little do they remember that the Devil is he "who worketh in all the children of disobedience;" that he can give thoughts and mighty powers both of utterance and of action; and that he can deceive them into the notion that they have no lord over them, whilst all the time they are with body and soul serving *him*.

Six times the Scripture, in the first of Genesis, affirms that each of the six days of creation were literal days. At the close of the history of each successive day, we find it declared that the day spoken of was "*an evening and morning*," that is to say, a period commencing with one evening, and terminating at the commencement of the succeeding evening; evening bearing the sense which all men understand it to bear.

Gen. i. 5. "The evening and the morning were day one."

„ 8. "The evening and the morning were the second day."

„ 13. "The evening and the morning were the third day."

„ 19. "The evening and the morning were the fourth day."

„ 23. "The evening and the morning were the fifth day."

„ 31. "The evening and the morning were the sixth day."

Digitized by Google

Are these statements ambiguous? Do they, to a simple mind, leave any room for a question or a doubt?

The late Professor Powell of Oxford admitted the force of these arguments. He admitted that the six days of which God spake at Sinai, must be understood as meaning six *literal* days; but he maintained that the words spoken at Sinai were incapable of being reconciled with existing facts. His words are: "In a former Essay I have adverted to the question of discrepancies between science and the language of Scripture generally, and have referred more especially to that notable instance of it, *the irreconcileable contradiction between the whole view opened to us by geology, and the narrative of creation in the Hebrew Scriptures, whether as briefly spoken at Sinai, or as explained in Genesis.*

Here is a plain declaration that the words used by God at Sinai, and in Genesis, are incapable of being reconciled with the facts of geology. In other words, Scripture is charged with having said that which is not true. The conclusion is indeed a fearful one—one at which we may well tremble. Nevertheless, Truth is not so much endangered by the open antagonism of its foes, as by the smooth treacherousness of its pretended friends. A lion seen in the way is less to be dreaded than a viper hidden in the grass. Professedly to honour the Scripture, and then, by a non-natural interpretation of its words, to make them channels of deadly falsehood, is something

Digitized by Google

more to be dreaded than an open repudiation of its testimonies. When they who reject, or pervert the words spoken at Sinai and in Genesis, shall, in the last great day be asked, whether there really is any ambiguity or obscurity in them, will they not be speechless? The proud voice of science will be silent *then*.

With much sorrow I have observed, that not a few who are willing to admit that God did in six days "*make*," are nevertheless unwilling to allow that He did in those days "*create*," all things. Scared, apparently, by the phantom-fear that the declarations of Scripture will not bear the test of the crucible into which science casts them, they are disposed to conciliate the dreaded foe by concession. Now, even if such concession were lawful, it would be of no avail; for our enemies reject it with disdain, as the preceding pages show. But the compromise is *not* lawful. It is based on falsehood: for the concession proffered is no less inconsistent with the declarations of Scripture, than is the statement that the words spoken on Sinai were not literally true.

The theory is, that the *creative* period spoken of in the first verse of Genesis is not the same as the "*making*," or "*formative*" period spoken of subsequently. It is suggested that the two periods may be separated by thousands, if not millions of years: and that in all the verses of Genesis i. except the first, the formative period only is spoken of.

Digitized by Google

The reasons for which the majority of geologists scornfully reject this theory, I will not here discuss. That subject has been referred to in the preceding pages. My object now is simply to show, somewhat more fully than I have done, that such a statement directly contradicts Scripture.

If it were true, that the earth was "created" at one period, and "made" in another, it is very certain that the Scripture would have been most careful not to use the words "*create*" and "*make*" interchangeably. When treating of the period of creation, "*create*" would have been used; and when treating of the period of making, "*make*" would have been used. Whenever the *six days* were spoken of the use of "create" would have been carefully avoided. Is this so?

No one can deny that the creation of man took place in the six-day period. Yet we find throughout the Scripture the word "create" used again and again in connection therewith.

Gen. i. 27. "So God *created* man."

Idem. "In the image of God *created* He them; male and female *created* He them."

Gen. iii. 2. "Male and female *created* He them."

Gen. v. 1. "In the day that God *created* man."

Deut. iv. 32. "Since the day that God *created* man."

Is. xliii. 7. "I have *created* him for my glory."

Is. xlv. 12. "I have made the earth, and *created* man upon it."

Digitized by Google

The making of the Heavens, which took place on the second day, is called in Isaiah a *creating*.

Is. xlv. 18. "Thus saith the Lord that *created* the Heavens; God Himself that formed the earth and made it."

Is. xlv. 12. "I have made the earth, and *created* man upon it."

Is. xl. 26. "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath *created* these things."

We read also that on the *fifth* day "God *created* great whales."

The fact, therefore, that the words "make" and "create" are used interchangeably in describing the works of the six days is a sufficient evidence that the period of *creating* was not distinct from the period of "making."

Moreover, if the things we now behold had been formed out of matter previously created, the statement of Heb. xi. 3, would be falsified. We read there: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed (*κατηρτισθαι*—brought into their perfected condition of being) by the Word of God, so that that which is seen (*το βλεπομενον*) did not come into existence (*μη γεγονεναι*) out of things that did appear." This could not be said if matter had a recognised phenomenal existence ages previously to the making of the things we now behold. In that case they would not have come into existence out of something "non-apparent."

Again, in the second of Genesis we read, "These

Digitized by Google

are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in THE DAY that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." These words refer back to the first chapter, and expressly identify the period of *creation* with the period of *making*. They expressly declare the period when the heavens and the earth "*were created*," to be THE DAY,* that is, the period in which they were *made*. If this verse does not teach this, what does it teach?

Nor are the preceding verses of this chapter less decisive.

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God *created* and *made*."

It is obvious that, in this passage, "*six* days of work" are contrasted with the *seventh* day of rest. All God's work is included within those days, and *creation* is mentioned as part of that work.

To the concluding words "created and made," I have referred in a preceding note. See page 28. These words have been variously translated,

* For remarks on the use of the words "THE DAY" as denoting a period (the extent of which is defined by the context) see pages 18, 19.

Digitized by Google

"created and made," or "created in making" (see note in Wright's edition of the Hebrew text of Genesis, and Latin version of the Syriac, *in faciendo*), or "created to make," or "creatively made." See Gesenius on the gerundial use of the infinitive with ל prefixed.

It matters little which of these translations we select. It is very obvious that the object of the clause is to mark the inseparable association of the *creative* and *formative* power of God in making what He made. Man can "make" in the sense of "forming" or "fashioning," but he cannot make *creatively*. That is the prerogative of God alone. This verse is written with the object of emphatically asserting this. God is in every sense the Maker both creatively and formatively; as is expressed in the well-known words; "I have *created* him for My glory, I have *formed* him; yea, I have *made* him:" that is, I am in every sense his Maker. Never, therefore, is God spoken of as "*the Maker* of all things," without the sense of *creation* being included in the word. Thus, too, when the New Heavens and Earth are spoken of we read in Isaiah, "Behold, I *create* new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind." But in Revelation xxi. where the same creation is referred to, we find the word "*make*" used. "And He that sat on the throne said, Behold, I *make* all things new."

Are we then to set aside all these clear and

Digitized by Google

express declarations of God, merely because proud men are pleased to call them in question? The province of man is an humble one; far too humble to satisfy the vain-glorious aspirations of science. Man's province is to observe, and to register facts. Men may search, if they please, and find out what they can in this ruined earth. They may, as I have elsewhere said, use their powers of inquisition, and may avail themselves of the things that they find. They may seek for the gold and the silver, the coral or the coal; and if the facts which geological science supplies, facilitates the attainment of the objects of their search, such knowledge is not forbidden.

But men are not content with the ascertainment of facts. They try to *account for* these facts, and *theorise*. They discover certain appearances in this fallen earth. They try to account for these appearances, and theorise; and then, not by facts, but by their baseless theories, they assail the Scripture. I say "baseless" theories, for no mere observation of facts can give us the knowledge of causes which God has not made known. Who can detail the agencies by which God caused this once blessed earth to lose that blessedness, and to groan in the bondage of corruption? How then can they theorise? Of the paradisiacal condition of the earth; of its judgment at the time of the Fall; of the creation of Hades within its bowels; and a multitude of other like things, they

Digitized by Google

know nothing, and can know nothing. They do not even recognise or discern the facts, and yet they theorise!! Are we to give up the Bible because of notions which are as empty, and as baseless, as the speculations of savages upon the sources of the wind?

The Church of God has grievously sinned by giving way before the "oppositions of science falsely so called." They may, for the time, bury their sin out of sight, and hide it from their own consciences, but it will, sooner or later, be discovered and (unless they repent) they will be compelled to recognise it in its hideousness. They have abandoned the Bible to its enemies, and have refused to maintain the unfailing veracity of God. God's own account of His own creation has been rejected as untrue. It is a sin that demands the deepest repentance, and the most unreserved confession. If the statements of the first of Genesis, and like passages, be relinquished as historically untrue, the gate is left open to all that the most advanced Infidelity may desire to teach.

The signs of the times indicate that the opportunity for repentance will not be afforded much longer. Even this favoured nation (the most favoured of all nations) seems now as eager to renounce the Bible as it once was to receive it. England seems roused to concurrent action by nothing so easily as by a proposal to extol and honour those who spurn, or undermine Scripture. What honour and laudation

Digitized by Google

345271A

have of late been heaped upon the memories of Carlyle and Darwin. See the character of that assemblage which this very week entered Westminster Abbey to do honour to Darwin—one who has laboured more effectively probably than any other, to sap the authority of the Word of the Living God. Well nigh all the great representatives of English society crowded to his grave to scatter on it garlands, and to chant over his body holy words which must cause every one who truly recognises the reality of the circumstances in the light of the eternal day, to thrill with horror. The condition of society in England seems too clearly to indicate that the long threatened hour of delusion has begun. "God will send upon men strong delusion that they should believe a lie." There is an "hour of temptation coming upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth." It is well that we should ponder upon those thrice spoken words, addressed to Israel, but not less true of Christendom. "Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." (Is. vi. 9.)

There is a time when light is given: there is a time also when it is withdrawn. The darkness that follows on light judicially withdrawn is a darkness that abides FOR EVER.

Digitized by Google

Society is becoming divided into two classes; over one is written "Withdrawal unto perdition"; over the other "Faith unto the saving of the soul."

Blessed are they who are able to say, "We are not of withdrawal unto perdition, but of faith unto the saving of the soul." *Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπωλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.* (Heb. ix. 39.) In every sense "by faith we stand"—faith in the truthfulness, power, authority, and faithfulness of GOD, who has "magnified His word above all His name."

Digitized by Google

Proposed Article of Faith.

Believing, as I surely do, that a time will come when they who fear God, will find it needful to abandon compromise, and to take up a place of open and avowed antagonism to the many falsehoods that are spreading around us, I have drawn up, suggestively, a confession of faith on the subjects treated of in the preceding pages, in the hope that it may commend itself to the consciences of some, and be accepted by them as necessary to the defence of the Truth delivered to our charge.

SEEING that many have, of late years, taught that the account of creation given by God at Sinai, and in the commencing chapters of Genesis, is not historically true, we feel it to be our duty, and the duty of all true Christians, to repudiate and resist all such statements as offensive and insulting to Almighty God, and tending to provoke His just wrath and condemnation.

We believe and confess that God did, in six literal days, make the heavens and the earth, and all that in them is. We receive in its plain and natural meaning the narrative of the order of creation as given in the commencing chapters of Genesis. We

Digitized by Google

believe that the period in which He made all things was the same period as that in which He created all things, so that God did both create and make all that He hath created and made within the six "evenings and mornings" described in the first chapter of Genesis.

And seeing that no man is able to state what the condition of the earth was in its pristine paradisiacal perfectness, and that no one can tell either the extent, or mode, or causes of the changes produced on the creation when God smote it because of Adam's sin and "subjected it to the bondage of corruption," wherein it still groans, it is obvious that it is altogether beyond the power of any mere man to define, or ascertain the causes which brought the crust and internal parts of this fallen earth into its present condition.

And seeing that if the veracity of God be impugned in one portion of His Word, it may be impugned in all, and so the Bible be made as unreliable as are the writings of men, we desire for that reason, as well as on other grounds, to record our most solemn protest against the doctrines recently promulgated in regard of the Mosaic Cosmogony, as doctrines involving heresies as destructive, false, and deadly as any that have ever been introduced into the Church of God.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A LETTER

TO THE

MINISTER OF SILVER STREET CHAPEL,

TAUNTON,

In Reply to His recent Lecture against

THE PRE-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF THE LORD.

Originally Published in 1845. Third Edition, Revised.

By B. W. NEWTON.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4488.

Digitized by Google

PRINTED BY GEO. HUNT, DUKE STREET,
MANCHESTER SQUARE.

Digitized by Google

A LETTER.

Sir,

It has been often said that controversy never fails to elicit Truth, and that Truth must prevail. I doubt not that it will ultimately prevail. "As I live, saith the Lord, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." "Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven." But when, *i.e.* in what period of the world's history this is to be, is another question. I cannot find from Scripture that the days are past in which they who would "live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution." I cannot find that these our times are essentially different from those in which the faithful witnesses of the eleventh of Hebrews and the Lord Jesus and His Apostles testified; and all these were, by the mass of mankind at least, scorned and rejected. It would therefore seem to me strange if we, with our scanty measure of truth and yet more feeble grace, should find a reverse experience—we who are living in those very days of which the Apostle says, "This know, that in

Digitized by Google

the last days"—the last days of our present dispensation, "perilous times shall come." (2 Tim. iii.)

It is not therefore with any vain expectation that the truth which I may hold will very extensively prevail, that I sit down to write. But I trust it may prevail with some. I feel assured that it will prevail with all who are disposed diligently and honestly to search the Scriptures to see whether these things be so.

But before I proceed, I must beg to remind you, that we have to remember when reading the Scripture that there is a difference between understanding, *i. e.* comprehending the things that God has revealed, and understanding that He has revealed them. For example, I do not understand the mystery of the Trinity: but I understand that God has revealed it, and I *believe*. The exercise of our understandings in ascertaining whether or not God has revealed any given thing is legitimate: but to set ourselves up in judgment upon the word of God, and to say that we will not believe unless we can fathom every thing, and explain every thing, and understand the manner and means of every thing's accomplishment, would be folly and sin. You may remember perhaps, the story of the poor man to whom the infidel objected that the throat of a whale was too narrow to swallow Jonah. "Sir," said the poor man, "if God's word had said that Jonah had swallowed the whale, I should have believed it." Now you do believe the narrative respecting Jonah: and you do not, because of the typical and spiritual instruction most properly drawn

Digitized by Google

from the history, nor because of the figurative language that may be found in that book, reject the literality of the fact. And yet it is a fact far more marvellous than that "the lion should eat straw like the ox," or any thing else mentioned in the eleventh of Isaiah. Surely we have little occasion to perplex ourselves with difficulties about the manner how—when God is confessedly acting in supernatural power.

And now you must allow me to say that I greatly object to the extraordinary manner in which not only yourself, but many other writers against the pre-millennial advent, invent (I do not use the word offensively) objectionable statements—imaginary statements—impute them to your opponents, and then argue against what they have never said. That there may have been very crude and very wrong statements in many millennial tracts, I am quite ready to admit. But it is not our place, if honestly enquiring after truth, to attach to a doctrine the mistakes of its defenders—especially when the individual more immediately addressed, as in the present instance, repudiates such statements, and rejects them as thoroughly as yourself.

For example, you mention a strange interpretation of a verse in Matthew xxiv.—about the gospel being preached as a witness. You state that it is said by myself and others, "that the gospel is to be preached among all nations, not for the obedience of faith, and as the means of their conversion and salvation, but as a witness *against* them, that God might be manifestly as

Digitized by Google

well as really just in condemning them." (p. 6.) Now all that I can say is, that I never heard of such an interpretation before I saw it in your book. I believe, and have ever taught, that the gospel as now preached for a witness, is preached as an evidence of God's love and mercy towards a ruined world—that He "desireth not that any should perish, but rather that they should come to repentance." I reject that word "*against*" as heartily as yourself. The gospel is adequate to the salvation of every individual upon earth; and its being preached, is a witness of God's love; but whether mankind at large will reject it or not, is a different question; and that can only be decided by the prophetic Scripture.

Again: you say that "we speak of the millennium as another dispensation subsidiary to, and *superior to Christianity, as left by the inspired Apostles.*" (p. 7.) The italics are my own; but this certainly is a most extraordinary statement. If any one had said that we are not as yet in the millennium, and that when the millennium begins, the order of divine arrangements in the earth will be greatly altered, I should not have wondered, except perhaps at its being thought worth while to assert so simple a truism. But I should wonder, if any one, who reverences the Scripture, has said that the system of truth, or any thing else ministered or dispensed in the millennium, "*is superior to Christianity.*" If it be true that any one has said it, he has said a very foolish and a very sinful thing; and until it be proved, you must allow me to hope that you are

Digitized by Google

labouring under a misconception. I can assure you that I never before heard of such a notion. I understand that Christianity, *i.e.* the system of divine truth delivered to the Apostles of Christ, is the unchangeable system of God, to be ministered in the millennium as much as now; and that the millennium finds, in the fact of its ministration, its chiefest excellency and joy. The gospel indeed in the millennium may be ministered under happier and more prospering circumstances than now. There will be then no longer failure in three sowings out of four! (See parable of the sower.) Satan will be no longer present (for he will be bound), to pluck away the seed sown—nor to spoil the wheat field by intermingled tares. The circumstantials of the preaching will be different: but it will be the same gospel of the blood of the Lamb—the "everlasting" gospel, unchanged in every age and every dispensation —the same Priest, ever living to make intercession in the holiest of all—the same truths as to the flesh of man—the same need of the one sanctifying Spirit. I must ask you therefore, at least as far as I am concerned, to withdraw this charge.

Again, on page 8, I find another statement scarcely less revolting. It is there said, that we teach that the Lord Jesus, "instead of sitting at the right hand of the majesty in the heavens—angels, authorities, and powers being subject unto Him, will sit upon a material throne at Jerusalem, and *have earth alone, instead of heaven and earth*, as the sphere of His authority and glory."

Digitized by Google

Here again I must say that the first time of my meeting with such a statement is in your book. I should certainly agree with you in saying that for the Lord Jesus to be banished, as it were, from His glorious exaltation in the heavens—to be confined to the earth, and "to have *earth alone, instead of heaven and earth*, as the sphere of His authority and glory," would be "a humiliation scarcely less affecting than His first." All that I can say is, I know nothing about such doctrines. *I* have not written nor spoken them, nor do I know any one who has. I hold, that not earth merely, but heaven and earth, and all things, are the sphere of His authority and glory for ever and ever.

Again: I believe and teach (though you seem to doubt it) that "we have received a kingdom which cannot be moved." Moses and Elias, Peter and John, on the Mount of Transfiguration, though for the time differing as to their manifested condition, were alike in this kingdom. I believe indeed that all who sleep in Jesus, and all the living members of this kingdom will, when the Lord returns at the commencement of the millennium, rise and join Moses and Elias and Himself in glory: whilst others, to be converted in the millennium, members of the same family will, like Peter and John of old, tarry on the earth for a season, until the time comes for them to be united with those who have gone before into glory, in the new heavens and the new earth, when "flesh and blood" are no longer found. But all, from the moment they believe, are in one blessed and

Digitized by Google

everlasting kingdom. The changes which take place both at the commencement and at the close of the millennium, instead of moving or shaking it, are appointed for the very purpose of enlarging its circuit and manifesting its glories. It is a kingdom that cannot be moved.

May I hope then, that your difficulties on these points will be removed? I reject the thought of the gospel being sent as a witness *against* the world—I do not believe that any thing is ever to be dispensed superior to Christianity—I do not believe that Christ is to quit the heavens, so as to have earth alone, and not heaven, as the sphere of His authority and glory—and I believe that we have received a kingdom that cannot be moved.

I now proceed to that which appears to be the main argument of your tract, the supposed irreconcileableness of the millennial doctrines with the statements of Scripture, touching the heavenly priesthood of the Lord. You seek to maintain two things—first, that the Lord Jesus has *for ever* sat down on the throne of God—secondly, that it is necessary to the exercise of His priesthood that He should be in heavenly courts; whereas you suppose that the millennial theory restricts and confines Him to the earth.

Now as to the last of these points, it has been already answered. The doctrine of the millennium, as delivered in Scripture, does *not* restrict Christ to this earth. "Heaven is His throne, the earth His footstool." He

Digitized by Google

will "set His glory above the heavens." He may visit the earth—He may order and control the nations in it; but heaven will be His home, and there He will exercise His intercessional priesthood, in heavenly courts, even in the holiest of all. On this head, therefore, your apprehensions are groundless.

As regards the first point, if you insist upon the translation "for ever sat down" (and I think you are right in this), these words must either mean absolutely that He has sat down upon the throne of God, never to rise again, or they must be understood in some qualified meaning. Now, not to speak of the impossibility of conceiving of Christ's being restricted to one seat for ever—nor of the conclusive argument that might be grounded on the word "until," in the passage from which the quotation is made, viz. where it is said, "Sit thou TILL"—"expecting TILL;" it is proved by abundant evidence from Scripture, that he did not sit down on that throne for ever, in the sense of never rising from it again; for how then could He have been seen *standing* by Stephen—how could He have been seen by John in Patmos—how could He, at a yet future period, be brought before the Antient of Days, to be invested with the power of earth (Dan. vii.)—how could He, as He yet will, descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God—how could He be seen, as in Matthew, where it is said, "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit on

Digitized by Google

the throne of His glory"—and how could He be seen as the Lamb in the heavenly city, which heavenly city is by and by to be in the new earth? In any one of these various positions (and He is a Priest in all—Thou art a Priest *for ever* after the order of Melchisedek), He is not sitting on the throne of the Father—neither will He be in heaven, when, as declared in the Thessalonians, He will be seen descending from heaven into the air.

The context in the tenth of Hebrews sufficiently explains the meaning of the words "for ever sat down."* They are spoken in reference to the completion of that work of which the chapter is speaking—the work of atonement. The priests of old continuously offered and continuously stood, an evidence that their work remained unaccomplished—the Lord after having once offered, continuously sat down, *i.e.* He assumed for ever a position of rest, as regards the work of propitiation, in token that the work was finished. A Peer of this realm might say that he had taken his seat in Parliament for life—

---

* The literal translation of εις το διηνεκες εκαθισεν appears to be "seated Himself, or took His seat in perpetuity," and that in an official sense. It is not καθημαι, but καθιζω, and has the ellipsis of ἑαυτον. We are commonly accustomed to speak of a judge or a legislator "taking his seat" in an official sense, and this is the meaning here.

The official place of Christ's priesthood must be heaven. But He was on earth for forty days after His resurrection, without forfeiting His priesthood thereby.

Digitized by Google

but it would not mean that he was always there. The word is official. And indeed it would be strange if Christ was more limited as to place than were Aaron and the Priests of old: for though they frequently ministered within the holy place, yet as frequently they ministered without, and blessed the people.

If then there is a time when, according to your own admission, Christ will descend from heaven into the air, and yet continue a Priest—for He is a Priest for ever—why should the circumstance of our saying that His descent takes place at the commencement of the millennium, instead of the close, destroy the true doctrine of His Priesthood? And if He descends into the air, and yet continues a Priest, why may not His feet stand on the Mount of Olives, as they did of old on the Mount of Transfiguration, and His Priesthood remain unaffected? Air, into which you allow that He descends, is regarded in Scripture as a part of the lower creation. It is beneath the firmament, (see Gen.) and is considered as terrestrial in contrast with heaven. I grant, indeed, that the exercise of His Priesthood, especially its intercessional exercise, would be impossible, if He were to tarry on this earth—if He were to lose heaven and have earth instead; but this, remember, is your supposition, not mine. He does *not* tarry on earth. He does *not* forsake the heavenly courts, nor His offices in them. He will still intercede for the millions of His people, who will at that time be on the earth, yet in bodies of sinful flesh, and consequently liable to sin, even though Satan will be

Digitized by Google

bound, and who, therefore, will still need His mercy and His intercession. Yet this does not imply that He is always locally confined to the courts above. A judge or an advocate may have an appointed court in which to judge or to plead, but he is not always present in that court. Yet he does not cease to be judge or advocate, because he may quit it for a season, and discharge other functions. So will it be with Christ. Moses and Elias did not lose their heavenly sphere of being, because they were seen in glory by earthly eyes upon an earthly mountain. The Lord Jesus did not lose His heavenly exaltation, because He was seen by, and spake to, John in Patmos. Angels even now continually visit this dark and sorrowful scene; for they are ministering spirits *sent forth* to minister unto the heirs of salvation, and yet they do not forego heaven as their home. Why then in a period of which intercourse between heaven and earth is the especial characteristic—when there will be an antitype to the earthly as well as the heavenly courts of the temple of old—when "ye shall see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man"—when the antitype of Jacob's ladder will have come—a figure of connection, not identification, between heaven and earth; why should not the Almighty Son of God pass from heaven to earth, and from earth to heaven, as easily as the high priests of old passed from one court of the temple into another? If He maketh even His angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire, and they speed more rapidly than light

Digitized by Google

from one end of the universe to the other, surely the spiritual body of the Son of God is still less subject to all material restriction of time and space.

Seeing then that I admit that the priesthood of Christ is eternal—that it continues to be exercised during the millennium *in heaven*, and that in its intercessional character—and seeing that I altogether repudiate the notion of His being restricted to this earth, you must permit me to say that the *main* argument of your tract is founded on a mistaken view of what the statements of your opponent are.

I thought until I read your tract that all Trinitarians were accustomed to regard the glorious manifestations of Jehovah—I mean the past manifestations, such as that on Sinai, as manifestations of the Second Person in the Trinity—because it is written, "No one hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." And again, the Apostle says, "dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen nor can see." I thought that these passages were always understood to teach that the Son is the constituted manifester of the Father, and if it be allowed as to the past, much more would it be true of the future. But suppose it be not so. Suppose that we understand the passage in Zechariah xiv. of Jehovah the Father—"His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof

Digitized by Google

toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south: and ye (*i. e.* the inhabitants of Jerusalem, being unprepared for His appearing) shall flee to the valley of the mountains; yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake, in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." This passage is so simple, so free from figurative language, (for even *you* would not ask that any expression should be regarded as figurative excepting "feet,") and is so evidently intended as a plain narrative of facts, that no argument could be employed to set aside its direct meaning, that would not equally tell against the divine appearing on Sinai of old. If then Jehovah is thus to appear on Mount Olivet, is Christ absent when He thus appears? And what difficulty would you avoid by saying that it is a glorious appearing of Jehovah and not of Christ? for I can hardly suppose that you will deny that it is a glorious appearing. You can scarcely refuse to admit, that a wonderful scene, such as never has been from Sinai to the present hour, is yet to be expected on Mount Olivet. Indeed you "frankly concede that the passage probably refers to what is future;" and I think if you look again at the passages in Habakkuk iii. 3, and Nahum i. 3, you may find reason to judge that though they are in the past tense (and what more common in prophetic visions, see Isaiah liii.), they refer also to this same

Digitized by Google

future glorious appearing of the Lord—an appearing that is to precede the millennium, for "in that day the Lord shall be King over all the earth, in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one" (Zech. xii.)

You seem doubtful whether or not to accuse us of saying that Christ is to sit on the "identical," "material" throne of David. But did you ever hear me say, or can you find in any of my tracts, any thing about the "identical" throne of David, or even about "a material" throne? I have never used the words "identical" or "material," or any thing like them. I suppose that the "identical" throne of David has long since crumbled into dust, never to be restored; and yet I believe that the Lord Jesus will exercise over the earth the same kind of definite authority and rule as was once exercised by David and Solomon: and this I understand the Scripture to mean, when it foretels that He shall occupy the throne of His father David. I suppose that no one ever thought of enquiring into the nature of that throne on which, it is said, He shall sit when He shall come, and all the holy angels with Him—or into the nature of those garments which, on the Mount of Transfiguration, shone as the light; nor would I desire to be wise above what is written, and to determine *how* the Lord Jesus "shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before His antients gloriously."

The truth is, that the question between us does not turn upon any point about simple or figurative language, nor upon the precise mode or form in which Christ will

Digitized by Google

reign over the nations; but the question is this, whether Christ is at present exercising the same *kind* of power over the nations as He will exercise when the millennium begins. I answer unhesitatingly, No!

It is true that He is now seated on the throne of God, and exercises all the power of that throne—all power is given unto Him in heaven and earth. But what if that Almighty throne has been pleased to delegate a certain portion of its power to others. Power that I delegate, is power, and power possessed by myself—for else I could neither delegate it nor resume it; but power, whilst so delegated, is for the time vested in others, exercised by others, and not by Him who has delegated it.

If you ask me what Scripture shows that a portion of the power of the Almighty throne is thus delegated, I answer, the Book of Daniel; especially the second and seventh chapters. Supreme authority in the earth is there committed to four successive Gentile empires—and this authority is not resumed by heaven until the last of these empires has fulfilled its course.

No one has ever yet pretended to say that the last of these empires, under which we are now living, has run its course. No one has ever yet ventured to affirm, that the "little horn," whether he has understood it of the Pope or of Antichrist, has yet concluded his great words and blasphemies against the Most High: and therefore the Antient of Days has not yet sat in solemn judgment on these nations, and therefore the Son of man has not yet been brought before Him to be invested with the

Digitized by Google

once delegated, but then resumed, power over the nations. "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Antient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And *there was given HIM* (observe these words) dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." From the days of Daniel to the present hour, the Gentile empires whose history he gives, have swayed the earth. Their laws—civil, social, and political, (and who undervalues the importance of these things as bearing on the right order and happiness of mankind?) have given a character to the world. Legislation in the world has been their sphere—a sphere granted to them by God, quite as much as legislation in the Church is Christ's sphere; but their legislation will end in "great words and blasphemies," (for who can blot these words out of the seventh of Daniel)—and God will judge the nations because of this evil, and the power of legislation in the earth will be taken from human hands, and vested in the hands of the Son of man. I am willing that the whole controversy between us should be decided by the Book of Daniel.*

* These doctrines were not strange to the Baptists of this country once. There is still preserved a confession of faith as to the personal reign of Christ, which was presented by them to Charles the Second. (See Appendix.)

Digitized by Google

I must also beg you to remember that neither I, (nor any one else as far as I know), has ever asserted the literal interpretation of Scripture, if by that is meant that there are no symbolic visions in Scripture and no figurative language. Figurative language abounds in Scripture, and two of the most important books of prophecy, Daniel and the Revelation, consist almost entirely of symbolic visions. But all symbols and all figurative language, be it remembered, mean something. They teach us *facts:* and even if the language does happen to be figurative, I am not on that account to suppose that it means nothing, nor to regard it as mere hyperbole and poetic exaggeration. Poets *do* exaggerate—Scripture never. The poet draws a picture that is heightened above the reality. It is more or less ideal. The Scripture never heightens beyond the reality—never adds an expression simply for the sake of adornment. If the whole of its description were to be fully apprehended, it would leave no impression on the mind that would in the least degree exceed the reality. If I read the eleventh of Isaiah as a description from God, I expect to find *every* statement in some way or other, whether spiritually or otherwise, minutely fulfilled — but, if I read it as "poetry," I may pass over whole clauses in my interpretation, and say that they are the mere embellishments of high-wrought description. In other words they mean nothing — they are mere accompaniments to the picture. It is very easy thus, under the plea of the language being figurative or poetic,

Digitized by Google

to destroy all definiteness of instruction in the word of God.

But the Scripture in whatsoever way it teaches, whether figuratively or otherwise, seeks to impart *definite* instruction. It teaches facts, and teaches them simply, even if the medium of instruction be a symbolic vision. Suppose that God had caused us to fall into a trance or into a deep sleep, and had given us to see in vision, Satan—to see also the bottomless pit—to see an angel descending from heaven, enchaining Satan and casting him into the pit; should we on awaking have any doubt as to the meaning of that which we had seen—or would they to whom we might be commissioned to declare it have any doubt either? Should we say that because the objects that we had seen in our vision were symbols only and not realities, that therefore the subject-matter of the instruction was "figurative?"—or should we judge that we had learned *facts* by the symbols we had seen, just as plainly as if God had repeated them in our ears instead of presenting them to our eyes? Should we not say, God has revealed to me that Satan is to be imprisoned in the pit by divine power immediately emanating from heaven—and if any were to reply, "No! it only means that the evil principles of men's minds are to be subdued by the gospel—and not that Satan shall personally be cast into the bottomless pit"—should we not marvel and tremble at the scepticism that could so frustrate the instructions of God?

Again, suppose we saw in a vision disembodied souls—

Digitized by Google

and that we saw those souls live again, *i.e.* become re-united to their bodies, and that we heard a voice saying, "This is the first resurrection, and all who are in it are blessed and holy, but the rest of the dead will not live again until a thousand years have first passed," should we have any doubt as to the meaning of this instruction? I think not. No doubt the objects presented in the vision were symbols, but what has that to do with the facts taught by these symbols? Did Peter say, that because the animals which he saw in the sheet let down from heaven were symbols, and unreal, that therefore the Gentiles whom they represented were symbols too? Am I to say that the seven Churches in Asia were "figurative" and all the instructions given to them "figurative," because they are represented by symbolic candlesticks in a vision? Was the Church at Ephesus "figurative," or its threatened punishment "figurative," because itself and its punishment were symbolically represented? Why then should the symbolic chain held by the angel —or the symbolic souls seen re-united to their bodies, represent "figurative" things, simply because they themselves are symbols? Is it meant that every thing that is represented by symbols must be itself figurative, or that symbols can only represent symbols—in other words that the seven candlesticks are symbols, and the seven Churches too? And if this is not meant, what is meant? No one doubts that the symbols in the Revelation are symbols—no one thinks of asserting that they are literal existences—but the question is, "What do they

Digitized by Google

teach us? facts, substantial facts, or nonentities?" And if the first resurrection be not real, because we are taught respecting it in a symbolic chapter—are the last resurrection, the final judgment, and the second death, equally figurative and unreal—for we are taught respecting them in the same symbolic chapter? If we persist in saying that things taught in figures are themselves figurative, I do not see how we can avoid the worst depths of Neology.

Before I quit this passage in the Revelation to which I have been referring, I would ask you to read from the eleventh verse of the nineteenth chapter to the end of the eighth verse of the twenty-first. Read the whole passage as if it were one chapter. It extends from the second appearing of the Lord, through the millennial reign on to the creation of the new heavens and new earth, and forms one connected history: and although the medium of instruction is symbols seen in vision, yet I doubt whether throughout the whole of Scripture a more simple narration can be found. The subjects are, I. The coming of the Lord Jesus in glory, and the armies of heaven following Him, "He treadeth the wine-press of wrath." II. The destruction of Antichrist (you say the Pope) and the false prophet. "These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, and the remnant were slain by the sword of Him who sat upon the horse." III. The binding of Satan. IV. The millennial reign. V. The final judgment and final resurrection. VI. The new heavens and new earth.

Digitized by Google

Now it is true that these things are taught in symbols—but as I have just said, symbols represent realities. No one doubts that the white horse and his rider—the vesture dipped in blood, and the sword proceeding out of His mouth, are symbols, not realities. But what do they represent? Not surely an intervention in mercy, but in judgment. So also as to the beast. No one doubts that it is a symbolic representation. But whom does it represent?—The facts are almost too obvious to need a comment.

The question therefore respecting the pre-millennial advent of the Lord may be decided without reference to any passages on which there is disagreement as to the nature of the language employed. It may be decided either from passages in which it is *agreed* that the language is simple—or from passages in which it is *agreed* that it is figurative—or from visions that are allowed to be symbolic.

And now I must ask you to remember that if there be a *supposed* tendency in us, who teach the pre-millennial advent, to regard language as simple that is really figurative, there is a tendency in others, and I must add a real tendency, to explain away the plain statements of Scripture, by supposing figures where none exist. I mention as an instance, the arbitrary meanings so frequently attached to Jerusalem and Zion.

Throughout the historical Books of the Old Testament, no attempt, as far as I am aware, has been ever made to explain these words in any other than their simple

Digitized by Google

and obvious meaning. But the moment we read the Prophets, a different, and as it is said, a "spiritual" meaning is assigned, for no other reason, as far as I can discover, than because they are places in which there will by and by be a peculiar development of spiritual blessings, similar to those which we, who believe in Jesus, at present enjoy: and upon this principle, texts which belong to Zion and Jerusalem are not *applied* merely, (for *application* might leave the direct interpretation untouched) but *interpreted* of us, and the literal Zion and Jerusalem are altogether excluded.

Now if Zion and Jerusalem mean the Christian Church of the present dispensation, and do not mean Zion and Jerusalem, we might expect to find a consistent use of them in this sense throughout the prophetic parts of the Old Testament. How then are we to understand such texts as these—"I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping and turning it upside down"—"And the Lord said, I will remove Jerusalem out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and will cast off this city Jerusalem, which I have chosen, and the house of which I said, My name shall be there"—"Zion shall be ploughed as a field"—"I will make Jerusalem heaps, and a den of dragons, and I will make the cities of Judah desolate without an inhabitant.... Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of His fury—thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrung them out"—"Jerusalem shall be lifted up and inhabited

Digitized by Google

in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's wine presses; and men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction, but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited." *

Here then are texts of sorrow and texts of joy referring to Zion and Jerusalem. Can we interpret these of ourselves—we who escape the very sufferings which have come, and are to come upon Jerusalem, because we believe in Him whom Israel continues to abhor? If texts like these are interpreted of the Christian Church, the charge of absurdity and error will not be confined to those who are supposed to literalize the whole of Scripture. There would be absurdity, because characteristics would be affixed to the Christian Church, that are utterly inconsistent with its standing—there would be error, because the present and future history of Jerusalem, so important before God, would be expunged from the Scripture, to make room for these false applications to ourselves.

You must therefore allow me still to believe that when God speaks of His holy mountain in Isaiah xi. He means the literal Mount Zion—the place from which by and by, as from a centre, the truth of God, *i. e.* Christianity—for nothing is superior to Christianity—

---

* You say on page 10, "If we understand Zion and Jerusalem as the Church universal, and as such, the seat and sphere of the Saviour's dominion and authority, all is consistent."

Digitized by Google

will be diffused among all nations. And as to the interpretation of the whole connected passage—where you seem to regard the hypothesis of the language being simple, as so peculiarly absurd, and assail the supposition and assail me with no very measured sarcasm—I will briefly state the rules that guide me to that decision.

In the first place, I adhere to the antient canon, that where a literal interpretation can be adopted, the furthest from the literal is commonly the worst: and that the literal may be adopted where no proved absurdity or impossibility follows its adoption.

Secondly, I enquire whether a different principle of interpretation could be adopted consistently throughout the whole passage; so as for no clause to be dropped out or set aside on pretence of poetic exaggeration.

Thirdly, I ask which interpretation would best agree with the testimony of the rest of Scripture—especially those parts of Scripture which definitely apply to the same period.

These would be my chief criteria. As regards the first, you allege that there is absurdity, if not impossibility, in supposing that all these animals, the lamb, the lion, and the bear, should be gathered upon Zion, mainly, because Zion is surrounded by a city. Now whether it be possible or not, we have little need to enquire, if we admit that the time alluded to, is one of miraculous interference on the part of God. Not that I can see any such great impossibility in children and animals being found scattered over the hill or hills

Digitized by Google

around which many of our modern cities are clustered, say for example Edinburgh—and if such sights could be seen there, and if it were the metropolis of the earth, I should say that they were a significant and beautiful emblem of the universality of peace. And seeing that we know nothing of what the physical characteristics of Zion in that day will be—that we know not how its configuration may be changed at a period when "heaven and earth are to be shaken"—Mount Olivet cleft—and Zion miraculously exalted above the hills—we may well suppose that its capacities will be adapted to the requirements of its new condition. "I lifted up mine eyes again and looked, and behold a man with a measuring line in his hand. Then I said, whither goest thou? And he said unto me, To measure Jerusalem; to see what is the breadth thereof, and what is the length thereof. And behold, the angel that talked with me went forth, and another angel went out to meet him, and said unto him, Run, speak to this young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls, for the multitude of men and cattle therein; for I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." Here we find no circumscribed restrictions of space. It is unmeasured width—and therefore I do not know why the Lord may not, if it so please Him, display upon the open sides of Mount Zion a picture, though an imperfect picture, of Paradise.

Mount Zion will be full, as it were, of living symbols,

Digitized by Google

sights happy in themselves, but yet more as indicating the moral and outward peace which shall pervade the earth. It will be the centre of the earth's government and laws—"for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem"—and as such, its condition becomes the criterion of the world's condition. It represents what the world then is. If the knowledge of the Lord did not cover the earth—hurting and destruction would not be banished from Zion—but seeing that the knowledge of the Lord will be covering the earth as the waters cover the seas, therefore nothing shall hurt—nothing destroy—no, not even a reptile, on all the holy Mountain of God. The type of creation's blessing would otherwise be broken.

And when I apply the second of my rules, and enquire how far you consistently apply your system of interpretation to all the clauses of this beautiful passage, I can hardly suppose that you would attempt a definite explication of such passages as these—"the lion shall eat straw like the ox—the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp—the cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together." How could these passages be spiritualized without again plunging into all the wild extravagancies by which Origen ruined the Church, and made Scripture bend to the imaginations of his own misguided mind?

And thirdly, when I ask what the testimony of the rest of Scripture is, regarding this same time, I find it written that "creation is to be freed from the bondage of

Digitized by Google

corruption." Now if this text be true—if creation means creation in its lowest, as well as its highest spheres—if all things—"all sheep and men, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea" (Ps. viii.) are to be "seen" by and by (see Heb. ii.) placed beneath the feet of Christ, I do say that it would be very strange if they continued to tear and to devour one another then. It would be strange to see man still trembling before the lion and the bear—strange to behold wars ceasing even to the end of the world, and warriors beating their swords into plough-shares, and yet to find the animals at war with man, and with one another. But this is the supposition I am compelled to take, if I reject the simple interpretation of this passage. And as regards the impossibility of the lion eating straw like the ox, all things are possible with God, and if His power changed the nature of these animals once, (for in paradise they all ate the herb of the field, see Gen. i. 30) and changed it because of man's sin, why, when the curse is removed from the earth, and man placed in millennial happiness, why should not the animals also partake in the blessed change? I should have thought it strange indeed, if Scripture had spoken of every other part of this lower creation, and passed them in silence by.

I have now for many years been accustomed to hear the objections of anti-millenarian teachers, but I have seldom heard even an attempt made to grapple with the main arguments of their opponents. Isolated texts are

Digitized by Google

referred to—supposed difficulties are started, but no attempt is made to explain throughout such a chapter as the seventh of Daniel—the fourteenth of Zechariah, or the twentieth of Revelation. When it is asked whether the parable of the sower, and of the wheat and tares, are not characteristic of this present dispensation, and whether it is possible to apply such parables to the millennial period of universality, no answer is returned. When it is asked whether the epistles do not describe the condition of the Church, up to the glorious appearing of our Lord and Saviour (see 1 Tim. vi. 14), and whether they do not throughout describe the Church as suffering from man and from Satan, and not in millennial rest, no reply is made.—It is indeed an argument unanswerable, and of itself sufficient to prove that the glorious epiphany of the Lord precedes the millennium.

I have also observed that the denial of the Lord's pre-millennial advent is connected with a tendency to set aside the character of the Lord Jesus, as the Holy One, who is to take vengeance—and to speak of Him exclusively as the "Prince of Peace and Saviour." I have even heard it attempted (though I do not accuse you of this), to explain the description of His appearing in the nineteenth of Revelation—where His vesture is seen dipped in blood, and Himself treading the wine-press of wrath, of His own past sufferings on the cross. He is spoken of as the Lamb—but it is forgotten that He is also the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who shall "cry, yea, roar and prevail against His enemies." The sufferings

Digitized by Google

of the Lamb are spoken of, but the "day of the Lamb's wrath," and the specification of those on whom it will peculiarly fall, is forgotten: and the result of this is the saying, "Peace, peace," when sudden destruction is at the door. I would unfeignedly desire that you might be preserved from this—but you cannot, if you continue to deny that of which all Scripture testifies, "that the world will grow worse and worse as to religion, more corrupt and more wicked, as time rolls on, and that it will only have reached its climax of pollution and guilt, at the moment when Jesus shall return." "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be when the Son of man is revealed." These are words which, as I apprehend, determine the question between us, and are too plain to need a comment.

I remain, Sir,

Yours, faithfully,

B. W. NEWTON.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

Extract from the Baptists' Confession of Faith, presented by them to Charles II., March, 1660; for which (say they) we are not only resolved to suffer persecution to the loss of our goods, but also life itself, rather than decline from the same.

"We believe that the same Lord Jesus, who showed Himself alive after His passion, by many infallible proofs, (Acts i. 3) which was taken up from His disciples and carried up into heaven, (Luke xxiv. 51) shall so come in like manner as He was seen go into heaven. (Acts i. 9, 10, 11.) 'And when Christ who is our life shall appear, we also shall appear with Him in glory.' (Col. iii. 4.) For then shall He be 'King of kings, and Lord of lords.' (Rev. xix. 16.) 'For the Kingdom is His, and He is the Governor among the nations,' (Ps. xxii. 28) and 'King over all the earth,' (Zech. xiv. 9) 'and we shall reign with Him on the earth.' (Rev. v. 10.) The kingdoms of this world (which men so mightily strive after here to enjoy) shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ. (Rev. xi. 15.) 'For all is yours, (ye that overcome this world,) for ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's.' (1 Cor. iii. 22, 23.) 'For unto the saints shall be given the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom, under (mark that) the whole heaven.' (Dan. vii. 27.) Though (alas!) now many men be scarce content that the saints should have so much as a being among them; but when Christ shall appear, then shall be their day, then shall be given unto them power over the nations, to rule them with a rod of iron. (Rev. ii. 26, 27.) Then shall they receive a crown of life, which no man shall take from them, nor they be by any means turned or overturned from it, for the oppressor shall be broken in pieces, (Ps. lxxii. 4) and their vain rejoicings turned into mourning and bitter lamentations, as it is written, (Job xx. 5—7)."

This confession is "subscribed by certain elders, deacons, and brethren, met in London, in the behalf of themselves and many others unto whom they belong, in London, and in several counties of this nation, who are of the same faith with us." Then follow forty-one names, after which is written, "Owned and approved by more than twenty thousand." Hence it ap-

Digitized by Google

pears that the Dissenters had once the honour of contending for the personal reign of Christ on earth, and of suffering for professing of the same.*

The following passage is extracted from a Tract still in circulation, written by me some years ago. You will perceive from it, that my remarks on figurative language are not invented now, to serve the present occasion.

"But even when the importance of reading the prophetic word is fully admitted, great difficulty in understanding it is supposed to arise, from its frequent use of figurative language and of symbols. This difficulty, however, is greatly overrated and can hardly be said to be a difficulty at all. Indeed difficulty in learning from the Scripture arises, not from the employment of obscure or enigmatical language by God, but from the inaptitude and reluctance of our minds to receive that which He plainly and simply declares. Figurative language, simple language, and symbols, are the three mediums employed by God in the communications of His mind to us. In ordinary human intercourse also, all these three means are frequently employed and that for the communication of some literal fact. If an Indian were to come to me and say, 'Our bows we have broken, and our arrows we have buried beneath the tree of peace,' I should instantly understand, that his words were *figurative*, but intended to convey the knowledge of a *literal fact*, viz.—the establishment of peace. Again—if he were to break his bow and to bury his arrows before my eyes, he would teach me *symbolically* the same *literal fact*. And it would be a strange mistake to suppose that because the action was symbolic or the language figurative, that therefore the thing denoted was a symbol too. Yet this is the mistake into which many have fallen, and virtually their words imply, that literal facts are never conveyed, except when no figure, nor any symbol, is employed as the medium. I have already shown how entirely such a notion is contradicted by the ordinary practice of men. I will now adduce from Scripture an example of a literal fact being predicted in the three ways I have mentioned above.

"The restoration of Jerusalem and her people to the divine favour is a literal fact. It is taught us in Scripture.

"First, by simple statement, as in Zech. xiv. 10, 'Jerusalem shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's wine presses. And men shall dwell

---

* From Crosby's History of the Baptists, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 65.

Digitized by Google

in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction, but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited.'

"Secondly, the same event is taught us in Ezekiel xxxvii. by a symbol. The prophet is commanded to take two sticks, to write on one the name of Judah, or the two tribes, and on the other the name Ephraim, or the ten tribes, and then in the sight of his people to join the two sticks together, so as for them to become one in his hand. This is the symbol, its explanation is next given. 'Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land, and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all, and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all.'

"Thirdly, the same event is foretold in *figurative* language thus.—'Rejoice ye with Jerusalem and be glad with her, all ye that mourn for her: that ye may suck and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations; that ye may milk out and be delighted with the abundance of her glory: for thus saith the Lord, Behold I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream,' &c. (Is. lxvi.) It is manifest that the two last quoted passages are equally clear with that from Zechariah, which is in simple language, and therefore the difficulty which has been raised respecting figurative language and symbol, is for the most part imaginary. Indeed so little does the question respecting the character of future facts depend upon the settlement of any disputed question, as to the mode of interpretation, that I believe it may safely be affirmed, that the truth would remain untouched, at least as to its leading outline, if we referred to those passages only, in which no figurative language or symbol occurs.

The two Books in which symbols are chiefly employed, are Daniel and the Revelation. Indeed these Books consist entirely of symbolic visions. In other parts of Scripture the use of symbols is comparatively rare. The 37th of Ezekiel already referred to, contains two of the most remarkable instances: there are some in the commencing chapters of Zechariah, and one in the Acts, when Peter saw the sheet let down from heaven. No difficulty exists in the interpretation of many symbols, because the Scripture itself subjoins the interpretation; and in many other cases the clearness of the symbol renders the interpretation self-obvious. Thus the two symbols in Ezekiel xxxvii. are fully interpreted. So also the candlesticks in Revelation as meaning Churches, and the stars as meaning the angels of the Churches. The principal and almost only rule

Digitized by Google

to be remembered is, that the symbol is to be distinguished from the thing symbolized—the first is a sign, but the second a reality,—in other words, the candlestick is a symbol—the Church signified thereby, a literal thing."

EXTRACTS FROM MR. JACKSON'S LECTURE—AND REMARKS.

"*They affirm moreover, that our Lord's statement, that the progressive increase of His kingdom shall resemble the leaven which gradually, and in a manner imperceptibly, but certainly, brings the entire mass under its influence, does not mean the progress of that kingdom.*" (p. 7.)

Is there a consistency in the use of the figures of Scripture? If there be, why should "leaven" be interpreted in a good sense here—whereas in every other passage where it is used, it represents evil? Thus the Israelites were commanded at the passover to put away leaven out of their houses.—To the Corinthians it is said, "Purge out the old leaven of malice and wickedness."—In Leviticus no meat-offering with leaven could be accepted.—The Pentecostal loaves, which represent the Church, were taken with leaven, and sacrifice offered with them, because the Church is accepted with evil in it.

And if the whole mass is gradually to be infused with good, what room is there for the parable of the wheat and tares—the wise and foolish virgins—the sheep and the goats?—What room for St. Paul's declaration—"This know, that in the last days, perilous times shall come?" How is it, if the diffusion of good has been proceeding so long, that the very countries in which light and knowledge has prevailed more than in any other countries on the earth, are represented at the close by a "ten-horned monster, whose body is given to the burning flame," (see Dan. vii.)—when the Antient of Days sits?—Are the ten kingdoms of the Roman world alone exempted from this diffusive influence of good? Can it be denied that the professing church, from the days of Constantine and before, has fed the nations, not with pure meal, but *leavened* meal, *i.e.* corrupted truth?

"*Where are the twelve tribes, as tribes, for Him thus to reign over as David did? What man or number of men can now tell us where all the tribes of Israel are?*" (p. 10.)

"*Can any miracle restore the tribes of Israel, as such? Has*

---

* See parables of the xiii. of Matthew, considered in *Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman World*, as advertised at the end of this tract.

Digitized by Google

not their tribal distinctness been long since obliterated? Surely no miracle can make the descendants of one man, the descendants of another. If so, what becomes of the literal interpretation of Zech. xii. 11—14?" (Note to p. 10)

Did Mr. Jackson ever read *the last chapter of Ezekiel*—and will he say that God is unable to re-constitute the tribes of Israel? There is a passage in Nehemiah which gives no indistinct intimation of the manner in which the genealogies of Israel will be rectified. "These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but it was not found: therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood. And the Tirshatha said unto them, that they should not eat of the most holy things, until there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim." When the great High Priest is pleased to apply His own divine light and knowledge to rectify the deranged order of Israel, ten thousand intricacies will be as nothing.

If Zechariah xii. 11—14, is not to be interpreted literally, will Mr. Jackson say how it is to be interpreted? What meaning is to be attached to the family of the house of Nathan, Levi, Shimei, &c.

"*Is He (Christ) to go forth to battle at the head of the armies of Israel? Is He to brandish the literal sword? Is He to besiege and raze the cities of the surrounding tribes and nations? Is He to hough their horses, and burn their chariots of war; and is it to be said by the maidens of Israel in their war song, as it was of David, others have slain their thousands, but Jesus Christ, the prince of peace and Saviour of the world, has slain His ten thousands?*" (p. 11.)

If by this be meant, that because Jesus is the Saviour, therefore He cannot be a Destroyer, it is a very awful setting aside of those passages which declare "that He will be revealed in flaming fire taking vengeance"—"that He will tread the wine-press of the fury and wrath of Almighty God."

As to His wielding a literal sword, no one, as far as I know, ever thought He would. "Hast thou entered into the treasures of the snow, or hast thou seen the treasures of the hail, which I have reserved against the time of trouble, against the day of battle and war? Canst thou send lightnings, that they may go and say unto thee, Here we are?" (Job. xxxviii.) "The Lord also thundered in the heavens, and the Highest gave His voice—hailstones and coals of fire. Yea, He sent out His arrows and scattered them, and He shot out lightnings and discomfited them." Such are the weapons of His warfare. How did He destroy Jericho, Pharaoh, Midian, Sennacherib? He *will* fight, it is said, as when He used to fight in the day of battle of old. (Zech. xiv.)

Digitized by Google

ON THE NATURAL RELATIONS OF MEN AND GOVERNMENTS TO GOD.

In the preceding papers, it has, I trust, been sufficiently shown, that it is the desire of God that His Church, throughout the whole of the present Dispensation, should neither individually nor corporately, be entangled with the administration of secular power. They who are connected with "the Stone" that smites the Image, should be dissociated from all which that "Stone" is to destroy. They who through God's marvellous grace are united with the Son of Man now, and will be associated with Him in the glory of His Kingdom hereafter, should be separate from all that that Kingdom will destroy with judgment, when it is manifested in its glory.

But because the Church is to keep itself separate from the administration of power that is not directed by the principles of Christ, it is not, on that account, to stand apart in listless or hard-hearted carelessness, as if it could in nothing act toward the nations for good. The being beneficent to all men—the hearing, like the good Samaritan, the cry of distress simply because it is the cry of distress, are features of character for the display of which the

Digitized by Google

present condition of the nations affords increasing opportunity. The Lord Jesus fed unbelieving multitudes, and was kind to the unthankful and to the evil.

But the Lord Jesus did more than this. He was the Minister of grace, and has entrusted His Church also, with the ministration of grace to every lost child of Adam. The Church is instructed to say, "God hath so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have eternal life." The antitypical Serpent of brass, is placed as it were in their hands. They can bear it into every dwelling, and place it before the eyes of every sinner. They can speak of Jesus as the Saviour appointed by God, and say to all, that "through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and through Him all who believe are justified from all things."* "Behold, the Lamb of God."

Every one who casts himself on God, thus testifying of Christ, as the Lamb *slain*, is immediately placed in new circumstances. The value of Christ's name—the preciousness of Christ's blood is imputed to him. Union is granted to him with Christ risen,

* It is most important to observe in John iii. the connexion between regeneration and faith in Jesus crucified. Nicodemus said, "How can a man be born again?" The Lord does not seem to answer the question, but turns apparently to another subject; for He suddenly speaks of the Serpent of Brass. But in speaking of it, He does answer the question most fully; for He says, that whosoever shall look

Digitized by Google

whereby he is associated with all the peace and all the glory of the new creation of God. He "has passed from death unto life"—he "is born of God." He is accepted in the meritoriousness of Another. But because of this new relation to God (the only one of unchanged and everlasting blessing), we must not forget, that there is also another relation in which man, as man, stands to God. There is a *natural* relation, which man, as the creature of God, holds before Him.

The air we breathe, the sunshine, the rain, the fruitful seasons, are proofs that the natural relation in which God stands towards His guilty creatures, is one of beneficence and goodness. His providential interferences likewise, as "when they cry unto the Lord in their distress, and He bringeth them into the desired haven"—His warnings also, and His chastisements are results of the relation which He bears towards man, as their Creator. It is of this relation, that His servant Jonah said: "I knew that thou art a gracious God and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil." Jonah iv. 2.

to Him and to His Cross, as the dying Israelite looked to the Serpent of Brass "hath eternal life"—in other words, is born again. If, therefore, the soul says, "Have I been born again?" it may ask itself another question 'Have I looked at Jesus crucified as the Israelite looked at the 'Serpent of Brass?'" If we say, "Is there anything that I can place before others dear to me, that they might be regenerated?" —the answer is, "Yes—speak to them of Jesus as the Serpent of Brass, and whosoever believeth, hath everlasting life."

Digitized by Google

Mercies such as these, are, it must be remembered, the purchase of Christ's blood. The necessary holiness of God prevents the extension even of temporal mercies towards a guilty world, except on the ground of the intervention of One, who, having honoured and sustained the governmental holiness of God by that which He has rendered unto Him, does, in consequence thereof, receive from God mercies for others, which could not be granted or dispensed, unless the claims of God's essential holiness had first been adequately met. Many a mercy, many a bestowment of the Divine goodness, visits the path of the careless and unbelieving world; but all such mercies are purchased mercies—purchased by the blood of Jesus. Noah builded an altar, offered sacrifice, and "the Lord smelled a sweet savour," in consequence whereof summer and winter, day and night, seed-time and harvest, recur in their seasons—all purchased mercies. And yet they for whom these mercies are purchased may despise the sacrifice that purchased them (that sacrifice which Noah's offering prefigured) and never be themselves brought under its saving efficacy. Every one that is born into the world momentarily receives (though he may be utterly unconscious of it) blessings *through* Christ; but none, except those who are brought into personal reliance on His blood, have a title to say that they are brought into His Church, or that they are under Him as "the Mediator of the new covenant," or that they are under the new covenant, or that they are under Christ as their

Digitized by Google

Priest, or that they are under the value of His atoning blood. His blood is preached to men as a refuge from the wrath to come; but as men they are not personally under it. To receive blessings through it, and to be under it, are far different things. To be *under* it is everlasting salvation.

If the conscience of any bear witness to these things—if they recognise that countless mercies have thus been bestowed upon them, but that their responsibility has been increased thereby, and their guilt aggravated because of the unprofitableness and ingratitude, and rebellion with which, on their part, these mercies have been met, then, we can preach to them the Gospel of the grace of God. We can tell them that God, who well knows that all mercies received by men as men (seeing that they are sure to be misused) only aggravate condemnation, has been pleased to appoint that that same holy and most precious blood, through which He is able to bestow these mercies, should also be made the ground of pardon and everlasting acceptance to every one who, as a sinner, casts himself thereon. "Christ is exalted as a Prince and a Saviour *to give* REPENTANCE (for repentance is needful) and REMISSION of sins." Thus, even that wonderful relation of grace which God has assumed, in that He Himself undertakes the ministry of reconciliation and "preaches peace through Jesus Christ," is to be numbered amongst the other relations of love in which God stands towards man as man. We can say to every man, that natural mercies, providential

Digitized by Google

mercies, and the preaching of *everlasting* forgiveness of sins through Christ crucified, are all results of a relation of goodness and mercy which God occupies towards men as lost sinful children of Adam.

We must indeed be careful, as I have already said, not to confound these relations of God *to men*, with those spiritual relations which subsist only between God and those who are brought by faith into His Church. The relations of the Church are alone those of abiding blessing: nevertheless the relations of man are not on that account to be forgotten. Let us suppose the case of the father of a family, who, having received the Gospel, has himself been brought by faith into the Church of God. He may perhaps be surrounded by children, who have *not*, like himself, received the Gospel, who are, therefore, not capable of answering to *Christian* responsibilities. Whilst in this condition, he cannot treat them as if they had been brought into the spiritual relationships of the Church: but shall he on that account, say that there are no *natural* relations of God, respecting which he can teach them? Although he can not expect them to receive truths, or act on principles which none but Christians can appreciate, yet, he must not keep back from them such truths, or such principles as their consciences are able to understand. He has to teach them that there is one God, and to show to them the proofs of His holiness, His power, and above all, His goodness. He has to tell them that the Bible is the Book of God, and that in love He has sent it into the world, that men might

Digitized by Google

have a light to guide them into the way of peace. He must teach them who Jesus of Nazareth was, and why he He was led as a Lamb to the slaughter. He must tell them of the desire of God to receive sinners and to grant to them forgiveness of sins through Christ's blood. He must speak to them also of the holiness of God, the universality of human sin, the coming of the day of wrath and the everlasting torment of the wicked. He has to tell them also of the everlasting peace and glory and blessedness of those whose garments are washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. The actually subsisting relations between God and all His creatures, whether believers, unbelievers, angels, or devils, should form the subject of his instructions. He has to teach them these things as truths and facts, fixed and sure, because revealed on the authority of God: and although it be true that the mere acknowledgment of such facts does not make men Christians, yet the repudiation of them places them in double distance from God. It makes them atheists, infidels, blasphemers, adversaries.

Again, if we suppose the head of a family who is not brought by personal faith into the Church of God, to have, nevertheless, such regard to God and to the Scriptures, as to make him desirous of guarding himself and his household against the denial of certain truths which his conscience has apprehended as revealed in those Scriptures—would not such a father, and such a household be, and be regarded by God as being, in a condition different from one in

Digitized by Google

which the Scriptures were scorned, and the facts, which God had asserted respecting Himself and His Son, blasphemously denied? The former would not indeed be a condition of salvation. Perhaps nothing more might result from it than certain transitory blessings here, which God, in the order of His moral government, not unfrequently connects with the observance of His natural laws. But still the conscience of such might be expected to be less hardened against the appeals of God. At any rate, it would be a condition not marked by the same characteristics of obdurate guilt as when the scornfulness of the scorner is added to the transgression of the sinner.

And now, let us consider these principles in relation to the government of nations. There are governments which have for ages endeavoured to act as if they and their subjects were really brought into the Church of God. They have, in consequence, found themselves entangled in many a difficulty, from which they are now seeking to free themselves. They see that for a Legislature to pretend to act on the principles of the Church of God, when they and those for whom they legislate do *not* belong to the Church of God, is hypocrisy. They find also, that nothing is gained by the fiction. They have discovered that modern principles of government, most especially, are hindered rather than assisted thereby.*

* It is not difficult to expose the weaknesses and follies into which real as well as pretended Christians have fallen,

Digitized by Google

The withdrawal of governments from a Church-position, and their resolution to free themselves from principles, which, however binding on the Church of God, are neither applicable to, nor understood by *them*, cannot be regretted. However much we may deprecate the motives of that withdrawal, and the manner in which it is being effected, we cannot wish to maintain a fiction, nor to induce

in their endeavour to maintain governments and nations in a fictitious church position. The falsity and hypocrisy of such a position, and the disastrous consequences resulting therefrom, have been exposed skilfully and very unsparingly by a popular historian of the present day. His work suits the temper of the hour, and many are rejoicing in it. True, as well as professing, Christianity, has exposed itself to these rude assaults, by its follies and its sins.

It is easy for such writers to destroy; but what do they substitute in the room of that which they overthrow? Nothing, except virtual infidelity. They have no desire to lead men to the Bible. They scorn and hate it.

We are told by these writers, that revealed truth has no more to do with right government than with the right manufacture of a machine by a mechanic; in other words, we are asked to believe, that although governors stand in a *moral* relation to God, and in a *moral* relation to their subjects, yet they are in nowise concerned with the *moral* principles revealed by God, and can rule better without the Bible (which alone declares what those principles are), than with it!

Such is the path by which governments, pretending to retire merely from a Church-position, are, in reality, retiring from all truth, and wooing the darkness by which Satan is exultingly quenching the light of the Scriptures of Truth, and leading society blindly onward to the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgments of God.

Digitized by Google

men to profess to be what really they are not. But the withdrawal from a Church position is made the excuse for withdrawing from something more. It is made the excuse for renouncing other principles, which, in virtue of *natural* relation to God, are binding both on them and on their subjects, not because they are God's Church, but *because they are God's creatures.*

It cannot be indifferent to God, whether or not governments encourage principles which subvert such truths as men by natural conscience are able to recognise. There are some truths, which can be recognised by the converted only; but there are other truths, which men, as men, can and do acknowledge. They belong to a sphere in which man, as man, is placed; and although the acknowledgment of such truths does not bring into a spiritual relation to God, yet the rejection of them involves in the guilt, either of Infidelity, or Idolatry. The consequences of the rejection of the Gospel of salvation, may be seen, perhaps, only in another world; but the rejection of truths, which even natural conscience recognises, and which it is one of the great offices of government to maintain, meets with visitation even here; if not in the way of outward chastisement, yet surely in a judicial hardening of the heart.

A government is not asked to act as if it belonged to the Church of God, when we seek of it, that it should not cherish, or give effect to principles that destroy the natural relations in which man stands

Digitized by Google

to God—relations that man is able to recognise in the Word of God, and sometimes in the works of creation.

The eternal power and Godhead of God, are borne witness to, both by the Scriptures and by the works of creation. It is a fact which man's conscience is capable of recognising. Consequently, the denial of His existence, or the acknowledgment of other gods, or idolatry, *i.e.* the ascription to creatures of attributes that belong only to the Creator, is a breach of a *natural* relation in which man stands to God. The shutting up the Book which God has written, and the refusal to allow Him thereby to speak immediately to His creatures, is an interference with His prerogatives as God, as well the breach of a natural duty.

Again, to deny that the Lord Jesus is God, and that He is now administering the government of the Universe, is to deny an actually subsisting fact. Men may, to use the language of Scripture, count themselves unworthy of everlasting life, and spurn the salvation of their souls through faith in the great Sacrifice. They may reject Him as their Saviour, and refuse to submit to the principles on which He guides His Church. But they need not, on that account, plunge deeper into sin, and unite with the Jew or the Infidel, in denying His present existence and government at the right hand of power. The Lord Jesus has been made "both Lord and Christ;" and in that character, is administering the government of the Universe on the Throne of

Digitized by Google

His Father. To deny this, now that it has been revealed as a subsisting fact, has the same character of sin as a denial of the government of God.

Whenever, therefore, a government fosters any system, or forwards the influence of any individual that assails such truths as these, it forsakes the duty which it naturally owes to God. It is not a Church question, or a spiritual question—it is a question of *natural* duty. It is a question, whether, after that God has plainly declared certain things to be facts, men shall be encouraged to say, that they are *not* facts. Heathenism—Romanism—Judaism—Infidelity—are all systems which assail, not only the truths belonging to God's Church, but those also which concern His government of man, as man. Heathenism denies the eternal power and Godhead of the One God, and fixes men in idolatry. Romanism hides the Book of God, says that the traditions of men are "equal" in authority with the Scriptures of God, and, in bearing on the idolatrous Gentile world, whilst making war on *heathen* idols, leads back by pretended Christianity to idolatry again. Judaism denies the existence (save as of a malefactor who has perished in his sins) of Him, who is now controlling the Universe and upholding all things "by the word of His power."

There was a time, when this country governmentally maintained a testimony against idolatry, and refused to cherish institutions, or to pay the ministers of a system that practised idolatry and kept the Scriptures of God from His creatures. This

Digitized by Google

testimony was given at a time when the fiction was maintained of the government being so one with the Church, that no one could hold a legislative or magisterial appointment who did not receive the symbol of Church communion. And yet, notwithstanding this fiction, we know that the testimony of England against idolatry, and her national acknowledgment of the Word of God, were so far owned of God, that the desolating wars, which for nearly half a century swept over Europe, were averted from these shores. The history of Protesting England supplies many an evidence of the providential interferences of God on her behalf. But she has become weary of Him now. She is abandoning God more and more every day. His word is honoured no longer as the one repository of Truth. Lies are welcomed; and idolators and blasphemers honoured. Antichrist and Armageddon await her. England will be numbered among those nations that shall "drink, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more." (Jer. xxv. 27.)

Those who wish to banish all regard to the truths of God from the governmental arrangements of human society, have said much respecting the natural rights of men; but surely, no one can have a right to require of another, under whose authority God has placed him, that he should be raised into a position where he might more effectually labour for the destruction of God's governmental verities. On the contrary, the Governor has a right to expect of such an one, that he should respect the fundamental

Digitized by Google

principles of God's natural government, no less than those of the human government under which he may be placed. No one in this land is deemed fit to hold authority, who disowns the Sovereign as supreme—who refuses to promulgate her laws, or who assigns to others allegiance or homage that is due only to her. Is less due to the Sovereign who rules in heaven? Less cannot be due. How then, can we avoid the necessary conclusion, except by saying, that God has never promulgated one principle that affects human society upon earth, nor revealed one fact that can be understood by them? Few, I trust, would venture on the expression of such a sentiment. What remains, then, except to say, that His principles are first of all to be regarded—if from no higher motive, yet that there might be escape from consequences of sorrow and judicial visitation here.

Let it not however be supposed that I mean that the mere refusal to cherish Infidelity or Idolatry is all that should be expected from a government that recognised these *natural* responsibilities. It might in many things act positively as well as negatively: it might promote, for example, the spread of the Holy Scriptures. Nevertheless, as things now are, there would be a joy in seeing any government refrain, because it feared God, from nurturing and encouraging antichristian evil. It might refuse to uphold the idolatries of Ritualism and the blasphemies of Neology.

The condition of Agrippa was doubtless very far from satisfying the desires of the heart of Paul.

Digitized by Google

Yet evidently it was with a certain joy that the Apostle said: "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." His acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures did not make Agrippa all that he should have been; but it *did* place him in favourable contrast with the infidelity of Festus, and the careless and ignorant levity of Gallio. The light of Scripture had reached the conscience of Agrippa. It afforded a ground of hope to the Apostle that the testimony of Christ's truth might yet fasten upon his soul; and it did prevent his becoming the persecutor of the servant of God. Who, therefore, would not rejoice to see a reverence for the word of God so far at least awakened in the bosom of rulers as to save them from the abyss into which they are now hastening. It is vain to hide from ourselves that the governmental system of England has of late made rapid progress in renouncing the principles of God. The endowment of Popish seminaries—the deference and adulation shown to Popish Ecclesiastics—the honour paid in India and elsewhere to Popish and Heathen ceremonies—the determination to uphold and honour in the Anglican Establishment, the patent idolatry of the Sacerdotalist, and the no less open infidelity of the Neologian, are evidences of this departure. The Jews recently have been invested in this country with governmental power. The Jews are a people who pronounce Him by whom "Kings rule and princes decree justice," to be accursed. They are themselves under a peculiar judicial visitation from the

Digitized by Google

hand of God. They have said, in reference to the Holy One, "His blood be on us and on our children." A curse more terrible than the curse upon Cain rests on their heads. They are in a peculiar manner driven out from the presence of God. Will, then, investiture with magisterial and legislative authority bring governmental power nearer unto God, or will it remove it into yet further distance, where it will go on ripening for the hour of Antichrist? The influence of the Church (I speak now of real Christians) has rather accelerated, than repressed, the tide of evil. Some, with godly intentions, but with a zeal undirected by the word of God, have urged on the governmental body the maintenance of a Church-position. Such appeals, however, fell powerless on the consciences of those to whom they were made. The position was seen to be fictitious, and the attempt to maintain it, to be a kind of hypocrisy; consequently, the moral influence of those who advised it was gone. In addition, not a few who have argued on these questions have used against their opponents weapons not taken from the armoury of God. Recrimination and bitter revilings have not unfrequently marked their controversies, as the recent history of Protestantism in Ireland too plainly shows. Can we wonder that the hearts of the rulers should resolutely steel themselves against such appeals as these? Again, another large section of the Church (and they have been chiefly found among the Dissenters) have strenuously opposed the efforts of their fellow Christians in these

Digitized by Google

things, and have vehemently maintained that it is unlawful for the governmental body, *under any conceivable circumstances*, to hold a Church-position. Many among them, in doing this, have not feared to speak evil of dignities, and have united with men, to whom those well-known and awful passages in Jude and Peter emphatically apply. Moreover, in their anxiety to compel the relinquishment of a Church-position, they have entirely overstepped the limits of truth. They have drawn no distinction between truths that pertain to the Church, and those that belong to men, as men, and have advanced principles which, if they were true, would render the coming reign of our Lord and Saviour impossible. For, although not now, a time *is* coming, when the Church-position shall be held by the governing power of earth—when the Kingship and the Priesthood shall be united in One; and the Headship of Power shall be identified with the Headship of Truth. That cannot, therefore, be *abstractedly* wrong which is to be effected then. Christianity has tried, in the title of a Church-position, to govern the world. It has also tried, in a Church-position, to be governed by the world. Thirdly, it has tried to keep its Church-position separate from the world,—and while it has exhorted the Church corporately not to seek to rule the world, has encouraged the *individual* members of the Church to covet secular greatness, as one of the surest means of ensuring the universality of the Kingdom of Christ. But if Popery has displayed

Digitized by Google

the evil of the first of these attempts, and the established churches of Protestantism the second, surely the days of Cromwell, when the principles of dissenting Christianity were allowed full scope for their development, exhibit a no less deplorable failure. It was, indeed, an attempt to put a new patch upon an old garment. Strange that it should not be instantly apparent to every Christian heart, that that which is corporately wrong cannot be individually right, and that a Christian may not act upon Christ's principles in the Church, and adopt the world's principles for his guidance in the world. Christ lived, even as we, at a time when the "fourth beast" of Daniel was ruling in the earth. He sought neither to destroy it, nor to control its course. He owned its authority in the person of Pilate, as being from God, and was content to suffer. His Apostles followed in His steps, and why should we adopt other principles now? *

If any one can rule now with the Bible in his

* I have already referred to the attempts that are being made by some, to substitute for the systems of Christian or church-fraternisation which have failed, a system of mere human fraternisation. Certain of the principles and precepts of Christ, selected at discretion, are permitted to form part of the code of this new fraternity of man. See the principles avowed in the French Assembly by the *Protestant* M. Coquerel and others, and the writings of many in our own country.

This movement is essentially infidel in its character, but it is assisted by many misguided philanthropists, who, though not infidels, are not only endeavouring to make the world act

Digitized by Google

hand, guided by that alone, by all means let him rule. But if he cannot do this (and how soon must the impossibility become apparent to any one who tries), then what can he do except retire—retire and wait for the time of rectification; when He who is now hidden in the heavens shall return, and establish righteousness and judgment in the earth, and "the isles shall wait for His law." Yet, whilst in patience of hope waiting, we may (and it is our duty) warn, admonish, and plead with those in power. We may beseech them not to spurn the authority of God, or trample under foot His holy word. We may rejoice if we find an Agrippa who

upon principles intended solely for the Church of God, but are also taking away from the world the principles which pertain to it by the express appointment of God, whilst it remains in its present condition. For example, the Scriptures say, that the magistrate is "a *revenger*—the minister of God for wrath," that "he beareth not the sword in vain" (Rom. xiii.); but this misguided philanthropy joins the infidel in denying. "The penalty of death," say they, "is a vengeance, and vengeance is an illegitimate act." In vain has God said (not at Sinai, but to Noah) "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." The human mind, when under certain influences, is unaffected by the plainest statements of Scripture Truth.

Results of mercy are far more likely to be attained by adhering to the enactments of God, than by substituting for them devices of our own. A murderer's soul is far more likely to be driven to the one Rock of Refuge by being subjected to the terrors which God has appointed to bear on him here, than by having those terrors removed by the unauthorised and disobedient action of a human hand.

Digitized by Google

believes the Prophets, even as we weep when we see a Herod rage, or a Gallio carelessly and contemptuously turn away.

If, instead of forcing half-Christian principles on an unchristianised world, the Church were to draw its own principles from the Word of God, and, taking its own separate place, were thence to act upon the world wisely—making the right distinctions between things that differ, there would certainly be restored to the testimonies of Christianity a truthfulness and a vigour which have been long absent from them. We might become the means of saving many individuals, and it may be governments, from association with the coming Apostasy. Individuals, if not nations, might be saved from joining the hellish compact into which, under Antichrist, Israel and the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman world are about to enter, and might refuse with them to say of Jehovah and of Christ, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."

Digitized by Google

ORDER OF EVENTS

CONNECTED WITH

THE APPEARING OF CHRIST

AND

HIS MILLENNIAL REIGN.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

Reprinted from
"PROSPECTS OF THE TEN KINGDOMS," ETC.

THIRD EDITION.

London:
C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER.
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C 1.
1911

PRICE 4D.

Digitized by Google

First published in "Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms," etc., 1849.

As a separate Tract: First Edition, 1850; Second Edition, 1874.

Digitized by Google

ORDER OF EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE APPEARING OF CHRIST AND HIS MILLENNIAL REIGN.

EACH of the visions we have been considering attests that which, indeed, all Scripture teaches—the gradual but steady progress of iniquity, until the day of visitation from the Lord revealed in His glory. Whether we consider the Jews, or the Ten Nations of the Roman Earth, or the Heathen, or the Professing Church *as a body*, we find them all unprepared—evil having abounded in all. But the Ten Nations, and a large portion of the Jews, will be not only unprepared: they will also be involved in the blasphemies of Antichrist, having said both of Jehovah and of Christ, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us" (Psalm ii. 3).

All the descriptions of the antichristian period that we have read in Daniel show that the blasphemies of Antichrist will be allowed to ripen into full maturity before the Lord interferes in judgment. God will be denied, both as to His creative and providential power, and the truths, both of Jewish and Christian revelation, will be alike blasphemed.

Digitized by Google

Antichrist "will exalt himself above *all* that is called God, or that is worshipped." He will change times and laws, and they are to be given into his hand for an appointed period. All the arrangements of human life, throughout the whole sphere of his dominion, are to be remodelled by his Satanic skill. The saints (as many as are within the scope of his power) will be persecuted; and not a few will seal their testimony by their blood. "He shall wear out," it is said, "the Saints of the High Places." But they will be strengthened to endure, and "will not love their life even unto death." Such will be the character of the evil, which God's own mercy will confront with the Almighty power of Christ, that it may be swept away for ever. For this, even the saints will pray, saying, "Lord, how long?"

The matured blasphemies of Antichrist and of the Roman Nations are the immediate cause of the Session of "the Ancient of Days." In the vision in the seventh of Daniel, thrones were seen to be set, and the Ancient of Days came, and inquisition was made into the condition of the nations who had given themselves over to the blasphemies of Antichrist. The thrones were *judicial* not *regal*. It was not the court of God's government, but of His solemn assize, appointed especially for inquisition on the governing nations of the earth. Nations, not individuals, are to be the subjects of that enquiry. Neither the dead nor the living were placed before the Throne to be individually judged. The whole chapter belongs to

Digitized by Google

the Ten Nations governmentally. The effect produced upon the earth, by means of the power which had been so long entrusted to those Nations, is the subject of the enquiry. They will be weighed in the balances, and found more than wanting: they will be united in blasphemous rebellion against God.

The Session of the Ancient of Days will be a scene manifest only to heaven. No eye beneath will discern it, no heart be conscious of it. They who watch the signs of the times will know, from the condition of the nations and from the duration of Antichrist's blasphemies, that the hour is nigh. But the Ancient of Days will sit in heaven, and inquisition into the condition of the blaspheming antichristian nations be made, and sentence be passed upon them, and the Son of Man will be brought before the throne of the Ancient of Days and solemnly invested with the governmental power of earth, without any of these things being made manifest to any earthly eye.

The withdrawal of governmental power from those to whom it had been delegated in the earth, and its transfer to the Son of Man, is the event which terminates the Day of man, and commences "the Day of the Lord." It is in heaven that "the Day of the Lord" will commence, unseen and unknown by any on the earth. It is in heaven, not on earth, that it will be first said, "The sovereignty of the world hath become the sovereignty of our God and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever."

Digitized by Google

The first visible intimation which the earth receives of "the Day of the Lord" having commenced in heaven is conveyed by the signs in the heavens, mentioned in the Gospels. "There shall be signs in the sun and moon and stars." "The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven." These signs will be the immediate precursor of the descent of the Lord Jesus into the air. All the holy angels will attend Him when He descends from heaven into the air; but His saints will not be with Him, because it is said, they shall be taken up "to meet Him in the air" (1 Thess. iv. 17). There His descent will be *for a short period* stayed. Thence He will send forth His angels to gather together all His believing people—"all who are Christ's at His coming." They shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, before He has reached the earth—and when He descends from the air to the earth, they come with Him, and surround Him when His feet stand on the Mount of Olives. That is the moment of which it is said in Zechariah—"The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with Thee."*

* The word in Thessalonians translated, "*meet*" (απαντησις) means properly, to meet and come back with the person met. It is used of those who went out to meet Paul at Appii Forum, and accompanied him back to Rome. Thus the saints meet the Lord in the air, in order to accompany Him in His

Digitized by Google

The condition of the earth at the period of the Lord's descent into the air is to be regarded in four aspects.

First, there will be the Jews partly in their own

---

further descent to the earth. Απανταω and its derivatives are never used in the New Testament in any other sense than that of "to meet and come with." This will be seen if the *corrected* readings are observed. Thus, in Matt. xxv. 1, υπαντησιν, not απαντησιν, is the true reading.

It is very commonly said, that *the rapture* of the saints will take place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" but this is not so. *The resurrection* of the saints who have fallen asleep, and the change of those who are alive, will take place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" but between the resurrection, or change, of the saints, and their rapture to meet the Lord in the air, a certain period is to intervene. The interval will be doubtless very brief—to be measured by minutes rather than by hours—nevertheless there will be an interval. This is distinctly taught in the Scripture, by the use of the word επειτα, in 1 Thess. iv. 17. Επειτα means "afterwards," not *then*, as it is wrongly rendered in our version. "*Afterwards*, we who are alive and remain shall be caught up," etc.

The existence of such an interval is necessary to the accomplishment of Matt. xiii. 49; for after the true professors of the name of Jesus are changed, holy angels descend, and separate from amongst them the false professors of the name of Jesus, who remain unchanged. "So shall it be at the end of the age: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked out of the midst [εκ μεσου] of the just." These words, it must be remembered, are, by the context, limited to those who are found professedly "in the kingdom of heaven," *i.e.*, the professing Church. It is of that body only that the parables in 13th and 25th of Matthew treat. The "tares," "the bad fishes" enclosed in the same net as the good, the "foolish virgins," "the goats," do not represent either heathens, or Jews, or Mohammedans, or antichristian infidels. They represent only those who are professedly the subjects of Christ's kingdom. He will gather "*out of His kingdom* [not out of the

Digitized by Google

Land, as at the time of the Crucifixion, partly scattered throughout the nations, and many of them in captivity.

Secondly, there will be the Ten Nations of the Roman World—all owning Antichrist—all apostate from God—their armies gathered around Antichrist at Armageddon, and advancing upon Jerusalem (Rev. xvi. 16; Joel iii.).

Thirdly, there will be many countries still sunk

---

whole world] all things that offend, and them which do iniquity" (Matt. xiii. 41). He will not thus act towards the whole world, for He will spare and convert many Jews and many heathen.

If, in any part of the world, a true believer should in that day be found standing by the side of a heathen, the believer would be taken, the heathen left. If one of Christ's true people were standing by a Jew, he would be taken to the Lord, the Jew left; if by the side of a Mohammedan, the believer would be taken, the Mohammedan left. Some of those left amongst the Jews, and amongst the heathen, and those of irresponsible age, would be spared and converted; the others would be destroyed by some visible judgment, inflicted on them before they were removed into the unseen world.

On the other hand, if ten professing Christians were at that time assembled together, of whom five had really, five nominally, believed, those who had truly believed would, at the sounding of the trumpet, be, "in the twinkling of an eye," changed: the other five would remain unchanged. Immediately holy angels will appear, and separate those who are unchanged "out of the midst" of those who are changed, *after* which the latter will be caught up, together with the saints who have been raised, to meet and come with their Lord.

Moreover, after the true saints ("sheep") have been thus separated from those who only nominally profess the name of Christ ("goats"), both will be presented before the Lord whilst He yet remains on the Throne of His Glory in the air. He will

Digitized by Google

in the darkness of heathenism—countries, of which it is said, that up to that moment they have not heard the fame of Jehovah, nor seen His glory (Isaiah lxvi. 19).

Fourthly, there will be throughout the earth vast multitudes of Gentiles, who will retain the profession of the name of Christ. Few that acknowledge the name of Christ will be found in the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman World; for *there*, profession will, for the most part, be swallowed up by Apostasy. But throughout the rest of the earth, wherever

---

then declare the reason why the one are adjudged to be "sheep," and the others "goats." The latter have never discerned, nor desired to discern, between those who are truly, and those who are nominally, Christ's people; and consequently never given even a cup of cold water to a disciple in the name of a disciple. On the other hand, each of the "sheep" will be found to have ministered, on some occasion or other, to Christ's people, on the ground of their being His people. How important to mark well this principle! *Mere* philanthropy will not be recognised in that day; only such philanthropy as is combined with the recognition of Christ in His people.

It should further be remembered, that this is not the final judgment of those denominated "goats;" it is merely a declaration of the ground on which they are adjudged to be what they are. At the last resurrection (see Rev. xx. 11), each of those here denominated "goats" will be called before the Great White Throne, to be judged individually—each one according to his works. After having been adjudged to be "goats," they will be taken to the unseen place of punishment, there to await the judgment of the final day. The saints, on the other hand, after having been adjudged to be sheep belonging to the fold of the Great Shepherd, will fall into the train of the Lord's glory, and will come with Him.

Digitized by Google

Christianity has penetrated, multitudes will be found still bearing the name of Christ. Some will be His in truth; others only in profession. The first He has named in one of His own parables, "wheat"—the others He has denominated "tares." These together compose what is called in Scripture "the kingdom of heaven" or "*His*"—that is, Christ's kingdom. It is named according to its profession. (See Matthew xiii.)

This—His kingdom, will be the first subject of visitation from the Lord. We learn in the Gospel of Matthew that as soon as the Lord has descended into the air He will send His angels to gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity.* At the same time, His saints will be gathered to Himself, and will shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

The gathering of the living saints to the Lord is preceded by the change of their mortal bodies, as also by the resurrection of all who have ever fallen asleep in Jesus. The same moment that changes the living saints—the moment of the last trump—

* It is *not* said that He will gather *out of the earth* all that offend—for that would not be true, inasmuch as many of the unconverted Jews and heathen will be spared and converted. Neither is the earth regarded as *having been* His Kingdom, though it is *about to become* such. The expression, "His Kingdom," is limited in this passage *to the Professing Church*—out of *that*, He gathers all that offends. Neither Jews, nor Apostates, nor Mohammedans, nor heathen, are in this kingdom; and, therefore, cannot be gathered out of it.

Digitized by Google

is also that which awakens the dead that have died in the Lord. They arise in bodies incorruptible, and, together with the living saints in whom also mortality is swallowed up of life, are caught up to meet the Lord in the air.

We should accustom ourselves to consider the realities of that hour as they are revealed in the Scripture. It will be an hour solemn and terrible to nature; although the feeblest believer may wait in peaceful expectation, as knowing that grace, and only grace, is to be brought unto him at the revelation of Jesus Christ. The signs in the heavenly bodies are spoken of in Scripture as occurring before the saints are changed. They will be yet on the earth, and behold these premonitory signs before the trumpet sounds. "When these things [*i.e.*, signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars] begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." But as soon as the Lord descends into the air, the same trumpet that announces His presence changes them, and angels are sent to gather them to the Lord. Angels are also sent to seize on those who are unchanged, and to gather them from among the righteous (Matt. xiii.). But the saints are changed, and cease to be the subjects of mortal feelings before that separation is effected — otherwise they might be unable to bear its agony. "Herein is love made perfect in its dealings with us (in order that we might have confidence in the day of

Digitized by Google

judgment*), because as He [Christ] IS, so are we in this world" (1 John iv. 17).

Few living saints, and few mere professing Christians, will be found in the Antichristian Kingdoms at that hour. Neither those kingdoms, nor heathen countries, are the *first* subjects of the dealing of the Lord's hand. Nevertheless, seeing that the Antichristian Kingdoms and the Land of Israel have been, in past ages, the home of multitudes who have died in the Lord, the graves of such will open, and

---

* The day of God's judgment begins as soon as the Lord Jesus returns. The principles of God's holiness are then manifestly applied to the condition of human things. The raising all who have fallen asleep in Christ, and the leaving all the rest of the dead unraised, is an act of discriminative judgment. Another is the separation of the "Tares" and the "Wheat"—another the destruction of the antichristian nations, and the visitation on Israel. Indeed, the whole of the Millennium has, more or less, the character of discriminative judgment. Then also, "He will give reward to His servants the Prophets, and to the Saints, and those who fear His name, the small and the great."

In order that we might have confidence in the day in which the principles of His holiness are applied to the condition of human things below, the love of God has been pleased already to grant to the feeblest believer union with, and acceptance in, His Son: in other words, to make him, even whilst here, what Christ IS. We are *already* accepted in the *Beloved—already* we are regarded as one with Christ—and when He returns, we are instantly to be changed, and made manifestly like Him, whilst we are yet beneath the skies; and thus we shall have confidence, even whilst beholding the glory and the terror of that day, when the heavens and the earth shall shake. In this, we shall prove the perfectness of His love in its dealing with us. The being changed in the twinkling of an eye, into Christ's heavenly likeness, will give us confidence in that "Day of Judgment."

Digitized by Google

every sleeping saint will be seen awakened for the glory of the first resurrection. The *whole* earth, therefore (for some believers may have died in, or be living in even heathen lands), will teem with glorified saints, and with angels sent forth to gather them to the Lord. The Lord will be visibly present in the air, whilst these things are transpiring in the earth below.

It is thus that the Day of the Lord commences *in the earth.* It will commence by signs in the created heavens (Luke xxi.); by the withdrawal of all natural sources of light; by the descent of the Lord, accompanied by the holy angels, into the air; by the trumpet being blown; by the dead saints rising from their graves in glory, and by the living saints being changed and glorified whilst yet in the earth; by the instantaneous severance, through the instrumentality of angels, of the changed saints "out of the midst" (εκ μεσου) of their professing brethren who remain unchanged (see Matt. xiii.); by the taking up of all the glorified saints into the air, to meet and to come with their Lord. For as soon as His saints have been gathered to Him and have fallen into their appointed place in the train of His glory, and as soon as "the tares" (*i.e.*, those who are found to be mere professors of His name) have been borne away by angels to their place of punishment, the Lord will instantly descend to the earth. "His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, . . . Jehovah, my God, shall come, and all the

Digitized by Google

saints with Thee" (Zech. xiv.). His object will be the rescue of Jerusalem, for the time of her forgiveness and glory will have come. Antichrist will have gathered all the strength of the Ten Kingdoms to Armageddon, not knowing, or not believing, that he will gather them there "for the war of the great day of God the Almighty" (εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος) (see Rev. xvi. 14). Whilst encamped at Armageddon, he will assail and capture Jerusalem, which will have rebelled against him, will carry half of the people into captivity (see Zech. xiv. 1), and will destroy the two witnesses of God (Rev. xi. 7) when they shall have finished their sackcloth testimony. But not satisfied with this, he will further seek, in union with Moab, Ammon, and others of the ancient enemies of Israel, to crush Israel utterly, and to blot out their name from the earth. "They have said, Come, and let us cut them off from being a nation; that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance" (Psa. lxxxiii. 4). But the Lord will interpose. He will, indeed, scourge Jerusalem and purge out thence the sinners; but He will also forgive and defend it. In that day shall "Jehovah of Hosts defend Jerusalem" (Isaiah xxxi. 5). In the second and third chapters of Joel we find the description of that great "day of battle and war" (see Job xxxviii. 23). "Assemble yourselves and come, all ye Gentiles, [כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם] and gather yourselves together round-

Digitized by Google

about; thither cause Thy mighty ones [saints and angels] to come down, O Jehovah. Let the Gentiles be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat, for there will I sit to judge all the Gentiles roundabout. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come, get you down, for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision; for the day of Jehovah is near in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened and the stars shall withdraw their shining. Jehovah also shall roar out of Zion, and utter His voice from Jerusalem, and the heavens and the earth shall shake; but Jehovah will be the hope of His people, and the strength of the children of Israel" (Joel iii. 11-16). The claim which the Lord has upon one city of the earth as the city "which He hath chosen to put His name there," becomes the instrumental means of bringing the armies of earth into immediate conflict with the hosts of heaven. The very city which God hath chosen for Himself that He might make it the joy and the praise of the whole earth—that city to which He will say, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee," is the very city around which men will gather in fierce fury that they might utterly destroy it, that they might cut off the remembrance thereof from under heaven. "Spirits of devils working miracles," will have gathered the kings—*τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης*—of the whole Roman world (Rev. xvi.

Digitized by Google

14) for this object. But which shall triumph? Man leagued with Satan, or Jehovah? "Thus hath Jehovah said unto me, Like as the lion and the young lion roaring on his prey, when a multitude of shepherds is called forth against him, he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them; so shall Jehovah of Hosts come down to fight for Mount Zion and for the hill thereof. As birds flying, so will Jehovah of Hosts defend Jerusalem; defending it also He will deliver it; passing over He will preserve it . . . And Jehovah shall cause His glorious voice to be heard and shall shew the lighting down of His arm, with the indignation of His anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest and hailstones" (Isaiah xxxi. 4, 5, and xxx. 30).

Yet not even the knowledge that the Lord has come in manifested glory to take Jerusalem under the shield of His protection, will prevent Antichrist and those who are with him from continuing their assault upon it, and so rushing upon the thick bosses of the buckler of the Almighty. He, and the Ten Kings of the Roman Kingdoms that are with him, are distinctly described in the Revelation as daring to confront the majesty and the glory of Christ's own presence. "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them; because He is Lord of lords and King of kings; and those that are with Him are called, and chosen, and faithful" (Rev. xvii. 14). "And I saw the

Digitized by Google

Beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies gathered together to do battle with Him that sat upon the horse and with His army" (Rev. xix. 19). It will not, indeed, be the first time that man will have dared to confront and resist the visible presence of the glory of God. Neither the miracle of the divided waters of the Red Sea, nor the presence of the fiery cloudy pillar spreading darkness over the Egyptians, but light over Israel, prevailed to stay the wrath of Pharaoh and to prevent him from rushing into the midst of the divided waters. There also the subject of the contest was the fate of God's earthly people. Pharaoh said, "I will destroy them:" God said, "They are My people." We cannot marvel therefore if like madness of fury should be manifested again; especially when we remember that Antichrist and his armies will be gathered into the land of Israel by the immediate agency of unclean spirits. Those spirits of evil that will just before have dared to struggle against Michael the Archangel and his angels even in the presence of God's own glory in Heaven (see Rev. xii. 7), may well be expected to renew the struggle in the earth beneath, inhabiting the bosoms of mortal men, strengthening for the last time their tongues to blaspheme, and their hands to resist the God whom they hate.

The destruction of Antichrist and those who are associated with him, is distinguished, both as to time and as to circumstances, from the destruction of those who retain the nominal profession of the name of

Digitized by Google

Christ. Nominal Christians as represented in the parables of Matthew by "tares" sown among the wheat, and by "bad fishes" mingled with the good in the gospel-net, are not destroyed by judgments poured on them *in* the earth, but are removed by holy angels *from* the earth, that their souls might await in an unseen prison-house and in punishment the final judgment of the great day. On the other hand, all those who shall be gathered under Antichrist, to serve and to worship him, will be visited with visible judgment here. "Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their holes, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth" (Zech. xiv. 12). They will be trampled in the wine-press of the fury and wrath of God *here* (see Rev. xiv. 19); their bodies will then be revived, they will be cast into Tophet and their eternal torment will begin. (See Rev. xiv. 10.) The "tares" will be gathered by angels; the Antichristians destroyed by the Lord Himself. The "tares" will be gathered and removed, whilst the Lord is yet in the air, whither the saints also are to be caught up; the Antichristians will be destroyed *after* the Lord has descended to the earth. The Antichristians, in revived bodies, will be consigned to their eternal torment at the commencement of the Millennium, whereas all nominal professors will, in a disembodied state, await in punishment the final resurrection and the judgment of the great day.

Digitized by Google

This is the hour so often referred to in Daniel when "the Stone" shall smite "the Image," and cause it to become as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor—when "the Beast shall be slain, his body destroyed and given to the burning flame"—when "that determined shall be poured upon the Desolator"—when "he shall come to his end and none shall help him"—when "Michael shall stand up," and the remnant of Israel be delivered. That remnant is continually mentioned in the Prophets, but it is sufficient to mention one passage. "And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on My name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is My people: and they shall say, The Lord is my God" (Zech. xiii. 8, 9). They are also mentioned as an afflicted and poor remnant, who shall trust in the name of the Lord; but of whom it is said, that He will make them "a strong nation."

It is no wonder that their hearts should be subdued and broken. They will have witnessed the terrors of the reign of Antichrist—will have seen the plagues of the Revelation poured out upon Israel and the Antichristian nations—will have beheld the heavens darkened—the Lord descend in glory—the graves open—the saints taken—the Day of the Lord

Digitized by Google

come upon Jerusalem—the heavens and the earth shaken. They will see, and yet find themselves protected through all these things; delivered—forgiven—and not forgiven only, but accepted in all the preciousness of that Name, which they and their nation had rejected and abhorred. "They will look on Him whom they have pierced," and He will comfort them, and will say, with fuller love than Joseph said unto his brethren, "Now, therefore, be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither: for God did send me before you to preserve life. And God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Not one ray of light that had been sent to break the gloom of man's past history, will be absent in that hour of fulness. Every such joy has been typical or anticipative, and points onward to an hour of accomplished blessing, that will then have come. All these joys will be verified then, either in the saints above, or in Israel below—different branches of "the one family in heaven and in earth." *

---

* As an attempt has been made by many to alter the translation of this most important passage, respecting the *one* family in heaven and in earth, I would earnestly request that my remarks on this text may be read in "*Occasional Papers*," vol. i., p. 31.

There will be many others spared besides the remnant of Israel; principally among the heathen. Thus it is said, that God will send those who are spared in Israel, "to the isles afar off, which

Digitized by Google

The *spiritual* blessings of each individual Israelite, and of every other believer who lives during the Millennium, will be essentially the same as ours in

---

have not heard His fame, nor seen His glory; and they shall declare His glory among the Gentiles."

There is no reason to believe that the heathen nations will, when the Lord returns, be in any material respect, other than they now are; except that some of them may become more hardened through intercourse with antichristian or with nominally Christian nations. It is not likely that many more heathen nations will, *as nations*, assume the profession of Christianity; although many individuals among them may bear the name of Christ—some truly —others nominally.

It is, however, the plain duty of believers to preach the Gospel to every creature; and to visit, if they can, every land. Right prophetic expectation will quicken, not impede, true missionary energy. Nevertheless, we know that every land will not be visited by the Gospel before the Lord comes, else it would not be said, that there would be regions "that had not heard His fame," at the hour of His return. Paul says, that in his day "The Gospel had been preached IN all the creation" (ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ, Col. i. 23); and this was true as soon as it ceased to be confined to Israel, and was preached among men, as men; but Scripture nowhere says that it has been, or will be preached *to* every creature in the present Dispensation. The Church was *commanded* to preach it to every creature; but what the Church was *commanded* to do, and what it *has* done, are different things.

Although those who are gathered at Armageddon, *i.e.*, the armies of all the Antichristian nations, utterly perish under visible judgment, inflicted immediately by the Lord;—and although all among those nations who have borne the mark of Antichrist will also perish; yet some (those doubtless of youthful age) who have not worshipped Antichrist will be spared. Thus we find it said, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts (Zech. xiv. 16).

Digitized by Google

this present Dispensation:—our distinction being, that we are "first-fruits" (Rom. xi.)—those who have "*first* trusted in Christ" (προηλπικότας). Indeed we may give as the description of our Dispensation, that it forestalls the *spiritual* blessings of Israel in the Millennium—we having those blessings in the midst of tribulation and sorrow, whereas they will have them when all the outward circumstances of life around them will be circumstances of tranquillity, peace, and joy—Satan being bound, and the Prince of Peace reigning. *We* have already been brought under the New Covenant, which will *then* be made with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah. It is a covenant of grace, primarily designed for them, which they for a season have despised; but we, through abounding mercy, have already been brought under its provisions. Every blessing that we receive as saints, we owe to the being graffed into *their* olive tree, from which they, for a season, have been broken off. But they are again to be graffed in, to receive in more unhindered power than we, of the freshness of its sap, and of the riches of its fulness. Every vessel of the Tabernacle that typified to them the blessings of redemption, is a type already fulfilled to us. From the Altar to the Mercy-seat, all is ours. But it will be equally theirs. Often therefore, from the language of their future thanksgiving, we borrow the expressions of our present joy.

Israel in the Millennium will still be in bodies of flesh and blood, still having experimentally to prove

Digitized by Google

that in the flesh "dwelleth no good thing." The removal of Satan and his temptations will not change the inherent evil of man's nature: and if, when the stimulus of Satan's temptations is removed, and the external order of human life regulated according to God, the flesh be still found to lust against the Spirit, the inveteracy of its evil will only be the more consciously proved, and the more painfully felt. The nearness of the glory and holiness of Christ, the visible presence of saints and angels, the possession of every outward blessing abundantly poured upon creation and themselves, will make them the more acutely sensible of the presence of an evil principle within themselves, still opposed to holiness, and to God—something that "is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." None, therefore, will have more occasion to say, "His blood is drink indeed:" none will more need to think of Him, who will be "the Lord their Righteousness," and whose priesthood will sustain them in the presence of God. They will require, and will receive the grace of that same Spirit—the Spirit of the Father and the Son, who now indwells in the people of God. In them, He will be still the Spirit of *hope*, for they will look forward with joy to the hour of their resurrection, when they shall be changed into the likeness of Him with whom they will be united in life; and join the rest of the redeemed in "New Heavens and a New Earth," where fallen flesh will no longer be, but where all shall be perfect in the likeness of Christ.

Digitized by Google

There are certain truths, dependent on the immutable character of God, and on the nature of evil in man, which no circumstances can alter, no variation of Dispensations change. The great truths of redemption, and the arrangements of God consequent thereon, as made known in the New Testament, must be as true in the Millennium as now. It is an unchangeable truth, that without shedding of blood is no remission: that if any one be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature: that he that is in the flesh, cannot please God: that every one, who through faith "receives abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness," shall finally "reign in life." These and such like blessings pertain necessarily to *all* the redeemed, and by considering them, we gain clear and certain knowledge of the condition of the Millennial saints as to all that affects their essential and eternal relations to God. The Epistles reveal their spiritual—the Prophets their outward blessings. By combining the descriptions of both, their condition is given with a minuteness, that leaves little to be desired. *

---

* It is almost impossible to estimate the amount of evil that has arisen from representing the *spiritual* blessings of Israel in the Millennium, as different from ours. Many have been hindered thereby, from considering millennial doctrines at all; for they have not unreasonably asked, whether they are expected to believe, that the doctrines of Christianity are mutable, and that saintship in the Millennium is something essentially different from saintship now. They have consequently refused, and

Digitized by Google

The distinctive spiritual characteristics of Christianity, therefore, will not alter in the Millennium: on the contrary, it will be the sphere in which they will be exhibited more perfectly than they ever have been. In this present Dispensation, the corporate testimony

---

rightly so, to lend any ear to statements which involve such consequences.

There are few parts of Scripture which believers are accustomed to read with more comfort, than those parts of the Psalms and Prophets which speak of the *spiritual* blessings of Israel after they are brought under the New Covenant. But those who maintain the system of which I speak, instead of teaching us to distinguish between the *spiritual* and the outward blessings of Israel, and to appropriate to ourselves the former without the latter, refuse to us the application of millennial Scripture altogether, and represent the Christianity of the Millennium as something *essentially* different, both as to its condition, and as to its final prospects, from Christianity *now*.

Millennial Israel will be sons of God (Hosea i. 10, and Jer. iii. 19)—so are we (1 John iii. 2).

They will be under the Mediatorship, Sacrifice, and Priesthood of the New Covenant (Jer. xxxi. 31)—so are we (Heb. ix.)

They will be circumcised by the circumcision made without hands: *i.e.*, by the death and resurrection of Christ (Col. ii.)—so are we.

They will "please God," and therefore must have been brought into living union with Christ, through the Spirit, even as we, for "they that are in the flesh" (*i.e.*, they who are unregenerate) "*cannot* please God" (Rom. viii. 8).

They say to Him, "The Lord our Righteousness"—so do we.

They will be raised in His likeness, at the *last* resurrection, in virtue of being IN Him—we are similarly raised at the *first* resurrection, in virtue of being IN Him. (See 1 Cor. xv. throughout).

They will look forward to New Heavens, and a New Earth (Isaiah lxv.)—so do we (2 Peter iii.).

Digitized by Google

of Christianity early failed. The Church at Jerusalem was scattered—the Gentile Churches retained not their separateness—the corporate testimony of Christianity ceased to bear witness for God—and that of individual Christians has been isolated and feeble in the midst of abounding evil. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of the greater part (τῶν πολλῶν) shall wax cold." But when the corporate testimony of Christianity has been transferred to Israel, it will never again fail, or be dishonoured. Christ, as the Head of Israel, will discipline and sustain them. They shall have "teachers who shall not be removed into a corner any more"—"their eye shall behold them"—"the Spirit shall be poured out upon them from on high"—they shall hear a voice, that shall say, "This is the way, walk ye in it." Their Church-position is symbolised in the Scripture, by *one* golden candlestick fed perpetually by golden oil—a candlestick never to be removed (Zech. iv.).

A nation, thus made the depository of Christ's Truth is *the* nation through which, instrumentally, the whole earth is to be ordered. "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." They are not only to be "a golden candlestick"—they are also to be "a royal diadem in the hand of their God"—a royal, as well as a priestly nation. "Thou shalt also be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God" (Isa. lxii.). Christ also, the Head of Israel, is to sit as a Priest upon His

Digitized by Google

Throne. There will be no discrepancy *then*, between the Truth of God and the governmental arrangements of the nations. The Temple is to be sustained by Him who occupies the Throne.

But the Person of Christ is heavenly; His glory heavenly; His home, Heaven; and it will continue to be so, even when He is administering the government of Israel and the earth. When God legislated for Israel of old, He really descended on Sinai; but He did not relinquish the Throne of His glory in the heavens. When Moses and Elias appeared in glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, they actually stood upon an earthly mountain, and were seen by earthly eyes; but their home was in the clouds of glory into which they ascended. And thus in the day of Christ's manifested glory, the saints who are associated under Him, and with Him in it, are distinctly called, "the Saints of the High Places;" and the Kingdom is called, "the Kingdom of Heaven," because it is administered by heavenly hands.

The mention in Ezekiel of the visible glory of the Lord returning to *Jerusalem*—the Psalm which says, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem," "THERE are set . . . the thrones of the house of David"—the promise to the Apostles that they "shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel"—are all evidences, that the seat of Christ's administrative government in the Earth, will be established in Jerusalem, no less truly and visibly, than God was manifested on Sinai. "At that time they shall call

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem" (Jer. iii. 17). "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a KING shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His name whereby He shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS" (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6). "Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, *upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom*. . . . The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this" (Isaiah ix. 7). The Temple at Jerusalem is also expressly spoken of in Ezekiel, as one of the places of Divine glory. "Afterward he brought me to the gate, even the gate that looketh toward the east: and behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east: and His voice was like a noise of many waters: and the earth shined with His glory. . . . And the glory of the Lord came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is toward the east. . . . and, behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house. . . . And he said unto me, Son of man, the place of My throne, and the place of the soles of My feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever" (Ezekiel xliii. 1). This is the period of which it is said in the Psalms, "Because of Thy temple at Jerusalem shall kings bring presents unto Thee" (Psalm xlviii. 29).

Digitized by Google

But in the prophecies which speak of the future glory of Jerusalem, Mount Zion is peculiarly spoken of as the hill or mountain of God's glory. Thus the sixty-eighth Psalm, speaking of Zion, says, "The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan; an high hill as the hill of Bashan. Why leap ye, ye high hills? this is the hill which God desireth to dwell in; yea, the Lord will dwell in it for ever."

The two mountains of power brought into connexion with Israel, are Sinai and Zion: Sinai—the place of righteousness according to Law; Zion—of righteousness according to grace. The relation of Israel and Jerusalem to Zion, by and by, will be as real and as visible, as the relation of Israel to Sinai of old. The glory of God was seen on Sinai. The glory of God *will* as truly be seen on Zion. Israel was gathered around Sinai, and thence received care and legislation from God. Israel *will* be gathered around Zion, and receive care and legislation. At Sinai were the terrors of unsatisfied holiness. At Zion there will be grace, mercy and peace from God the Father, through the Lord Jesus Christ. There will be found "Jesus the Mediator of the new Covenant, and *the blood of sprinkling*, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." At Sinai, if a beast touched the mountain, it was to be stoned, or thrust through with a dart: but the sides of Zion shall be a vision of peace. The cow and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall lie down together, they shall not hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain. "And the Lord

Digitized by Google

will create upon every dwelling-place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night: for upon all the glory shall be a defence. And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain" (Isaiah iv. 5, 6).

Thus the *sides* of Zion will be the scene of peace, glory, and miraculous protection. But "the *height* of Zion" is the place where that heavenly power is fixed, from which this protection and these blessings flow. "They shall come," it is said, "and sing before the Lord in the height of Zion." The glory of God was in the height of Sinai; whilst the camp of Israel, the Tabernacle, the cloudy pillar, and the virtually royal seat of Moses (for he was *King* in Jeshurun) were all at the foot of the mountain below. Zion is twice mentioned in the New Testament—once in the Hebrews, and once in the Revelation, as the place of Divine glory, and of the glory of risen saints, in which flesh and blood could not share. On Zion were seen standing those who were redeemed from the earth—able to learn the song that was sung before the throne above—able also to follow the Lamb *whithersoever* He went. In other words, they were able to do the will of God in earth, AS it is done in heaven. This can only be true of those, in whom mortality is swallowed up of life—and therefore, to such, the government of earth is committed —"Saints of the High Places." "They go from

Digitized by Google

strength to strength, every one of them in Zion appeareth before God" (Psalm lxxxiv. 7). Zion being the centre of the earth's government, it is the place in which they might be expected to appear.

The great distinctive characteristic, however, of Zion, will be, not so much in the glory that is *on* it, as in the glory which is *above* it. "Ye shall see," said the Lord Jesus, "heaven opened." The heavens were not opened in peaceful blessing over Sinai. Sinai was the claim of God's unsatisfied holiness—and it ended in the heavens being as brass, and the earth as iron. But Zion will be the witness, that the claim of holiness *has* been satisfied, and that the sweet savour of peace, through the one accepted sacrifice, has ascended into the heavens. The heavenly places therefore, not made with hands, shall be opened towards Zion and the earth, and the Heavenly City of the saints made manifest, in token, that God has by ONE, even by Immanuel, the Son of His bosom, been glorified in the earth, and that He thenceforward designs to give according to the value of that which He hath received. It will be the hour of *descending* blessing.

The truths that pertain to Israel—(for to them belong the promises and the covenants)* have not

* "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen" (Rom. ix. 5).

Digitized by Google

been inoperative during the time that the nation of Israel has been scorning them. They have reached, quickened, and comforted multitudes, who have found in them, the cause of their sufferings, and the subject-matter of their service through dark and troubled hours of conflict and of sorrow. But where will the suffering children of the truth be when the hour of the promised glory comes? They will belong to no earthly city. Their blessings will be in a new creation—in the city of the Living God, the Heavenly Jerusalem. But they are not only to be blessed themselves; they are to be employed, and made a blessing to others. They, and the Heavenly City in which they dwell, will be among the gifts bestowed on those, who will have been made heirs of salvation in the earth below.

After the blessings received in the Person, redemption, and offices of the Son of God, there are probably none at which converted Israel will marvel more than in the provision made for them in the risen saints, and in the Heavenly City. The "Sons of Aaron the Priests" were accustomed of old to enter on behalf of Israel into the Tabernacle of God. The risen saints will be the antitypical priesthood; but they will minister in no Temple made with hands. The Heavenly City, and Heaven, will answer respectively to the Holy Place, and to the Holy of Holies in Israel's ancient Temple. In both of these, the risen saints will act for Israel. But they are not a Priesthood only; they are a Royal Priest-

Digitized by Google

hood—Priests and Kings, and as such will come forth in kingly power, to teach and to guide those in the earth beneath. Israel, softened by grace, humbled by affliction, and humbled by mercy, will be no longer too proud to receive the guidance of heavenly wisdom. The character of "the Saints of the High Places," who will then watch over Israel, is taught in the symbols by which God has been pleased to indicate the excellency of the Heavenly City in which they dwell. The varied lustre of the precious stones which adorn it—the purity of the pearl gates, on which were written the names of the twelve tribes of Israel—the transparency of its golden streets, well suited to the feet of those, who are represented as standing on a sea of crystal—are all symbols of a heavenly excellency, which will, by them who possess it, be necessarily communicated in measure to those who are morally fashioned under their care. Accordingly, the earthly Jerusalem will be made, in some degree, to answer to its heavenly pattern. There too, we read of stones of fair colours being found. "Behold, I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children" (Isa. liv. 11). Such are the effects of the heavenly agency directed towards the Beloved City. It becomes *in measure*, the counterpart of the city that is above, and

Digitized by Google

forms as it were, another court of the same Holy Temple.* It is well fitted, therefore, to be the centre of truth, and the centre of governmental influence in the earth; and being sustained in righteousness through grace, it will not fail in its high calling. "In righteousness thou shalt be established." "Their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the peoples: all that see them shall

---

* The Courts of the Temple appear to have been the intended type of the millennial arrangements—Heaven itself being the anti-type of the Holy of Holies—the Heavenly Jerusalem answering to the Holy Place.

Both these Courts were covered, and were therefore invisible to the worshippers without. They were called ναος in contradistinction to ιερον, which last was applied to all the sacred inclosure. The inner courts could only be entered by Aaron and his sons, who typify the Church of the First-born in their millennial relation to Israel (see Lev. ix.). The veil being rent between these two courts, the heavenly Priesthood have access into both.

The earthly Jerusalem will answer to the external court where Israel worshipped; and exterior to this was the court of the Gentiles; for the Gentiles also will become worshippers in the Millennium.

In the arrangements for the worship of Israel of old, the offerings of those who were not *personally* permitted to enter the Holy places were brought *by them* no further than the outer court: nevertheless the honour of the gift was regarded as rendered to the Holy Places, and to Him who dwelt there. So will it be in the Millennium. The Kings of the earth will not be able *personally* to enter *into* the heavenly City; (nor indeed any who yet continue in bodies of flesh and blood), but they will bring their glory and honour *unto* (εις) it, mediately through the earthly City, which will be the external court of the One Temple.

Digitized by Google

acknowledge them, that they are the seed whom the Lord has blessed." "The children of Jerusalem shall be made princes in all the earth," and the nations shall at last be regulated according to God. They shall be made glad as with new wine—wine which they had never tasted before—no longer the wine of the wrath of the fornication of the daughter of Babylon. We can well understand, therefore, why it should be said: "For Zion's sake, will I not hold My peace, and for Jerusalem's sake, I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth . . . ye that make mention of the Lord, keep not silence, and give Him no rest, till He establish, and till He make Jerusalem a praise in the earth" (Isa. lxii. 1).*

The full and ordered glory of the Millennium, however, is not introduced until some time after the Day of visitation upon Jerusalem. That Day of visitation will be only *one* day. "It shall be *one*

* It is very commonly thought that the Ten Tribes have been lost since the time of their first captivity: and they are supposed to be still dwelling in some unknown region. But there is not the slightest authority in Scripture for saying that they are lost: on the contrary, "*both* the Houses of Israel," are declared to have rejected Jesus. "He shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence *to both the houses of Israel.*" Moreover, Paul says, "to which promise our *twelve* tribes instantly serving God day and night, hope to come:" and James writes expressly to the converts among the twelve tribes. The Scripture therefore does not regard them as lost

Digitized by Google

day, known unto the Lord" (Zech. xiv.). In it Israel will be nationally forgiven; and the remnant spared in the Land of Israel, will look on Him whom they have pierced, and mourn. But the greater part of Israel will be in distant lands—some having been carried captive during the days of Antichrist, others scattered by his persecutions, whilst others will be voluntarily sojourning in the uttermost regions of the earth, worshippers of the wealth and mercantile greatness of Babylon and Tyre. These will not escape the judgments that fall, more or less, upon the whole house of Israel: "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you; And I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant. And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against Me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the Lord" (Ezekiel xx. 33).

Digitized by Google

But if the wilderness be the place where this part of Israel is "pleaded with," and purified; it is also the place where they shall find mercy. "Therefore, behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her. And I will give her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall sing there, as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt" (Hosea ii. 14). "According to the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt, will I show unto him marvellous things. The nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and shall fear because of thee" (Micah vii. 15). This is the time of which it is said: "I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert. The beast of the field shall honour Me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness and rivers in the desert, to give drink to My people, my chosen" (Isa. xliii. 19). "The Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian Sea;* and with

* Tongue or "*bay*" of the Egyptian Sea. This word "tongue" is rendered "bay" three times in Joshua xv. and xviii. The bay of the Egyptian Sea is that part of the Red Sea which Israel formerly crossed. It is a bay about 200 miles long, extending from the promontory of the wilderness of Sinai to Suez. The land of Israel will by and by include the wilderness of Sinai (see Ezekiel). Thus when the seven streams of the Nile, and the bay of Suez, shall be dried up, Egypt, Israel,

Digitized by Google

His mighty wind shall He shake His hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod. And there shall be an highway for the remnant of His people which shall be left from Assyria, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt" (Isa. xi. 15). Besides those who are thus immediately gathered by the Lord, we read of others brought by the nations at the commandment of the Lord. "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth" (Isa. xliii. 6). "In that time, shall the present be brought unto the Lord of Hosts, of a people scattered and peeled, and from a people terrible from their beginning hitherto; a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose land the rivers have spoiled, to the place

---

and Assyria will stand in close and uninterrupted connexion—the closeness of their physical connexion symbolising the intimacy of their moral union. The millennium abounds with arrangements intended to symbolise higher blessings. It is as it were a system of living symbols. The union of Egypt, Israel, and Assyria is thus mentioned in the Scripture. "In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land: whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt My people, and Assyria the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance" (Isa .xix. 23—25).

Digitized by Google

of the name of the Lord of Hosts, the Mount Zion" (Isa. xviii.).*

* Whilst Israel is being gradually assembled, judgments are sent upon many nations, which, although they have escaped Antichrist, have nevertheless been rebellious against the Lord, and persecutors of Israel. It is during this period apparently, that the Gog and Magog nations assail the land of Israel, in the manner narrated in Ezekiel (see ch. xxxviii.). The ordered glory of the millennium will not have been introduced (although Israel is forgiven) at the time when they are thus attacked. This invasion must not be mistaken for the rebellion mentioned at the close of the millennium.

There appears to be a considerable interval between the appearance of the Lord in destructive glory, and the period when He will be "inaugurated" on Zion, and introduce the peaceful glory of the millennium. There was a considerable interval between the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts at the Red Sea, and the descent of God, as the manifested Legislator of Israel on Mount Sinai: and the conflict of Israel with Amalek intervened. So there will again intervene a period betwixt the destruction of Antichrist and his hosts, and the inauguration of Christ's glory on Zion—in which interval Israel's conflict with Gog and Magog and other enemies, will occur. Christ's glory, when He first appears to take His saints, and to deliver Israel, is symbolised by the Morning Star, which rises before the sun, whilst the earth is yet sunk in the deepest darkness of night. "The stars," as not belonging to our system, are fit emblems of distant and unknown glory. But when the hour comes for the peaceful glory of the millennium to be brought in, then the Lord is represented as the Sun arising with healing on His wings. His glory will then be adapted to the condition of the earth and of men upon it, as when He was seen by human eyes on the Mount of Transfiguration. But when seen in the sphere of His unearthly glory, even John "fell at His feet as dead." Flesh and blood can have no communion with His glory as the bright and morning star: but the changed saints will. "To him that overcometh will I give the morning star;" *i.e.* he shall be brought into the sphere of My own unearthly glory.

Digitized by Google

Whilst the Lord is thus re-gathering Israel, and at the same time sending many judgments among the spared nations, who are to be broken before they are healed, He will introduce His saints into their heavenly mansions above, according to the promise—"I will come again and receive you unto Myself, that where I am, there ye may be also. In My Father's house are many mansions." This is the period of which it is said, that He who loved the Church and gave Himself for it, will present it unto Himself "a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing" (Eph. v.). (See also Rev. xix.)

"And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: because the Lord our God the Almighty hath reigned. Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give glory to Him, because the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His Wife hath made herself ready. And it was given to her that she should be arrayed in fine linen bright and pure; for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints" (Rev. xix., Tregelles' version). The Church unitedly, and each believer individually, will recognise themselves to be perfect then, and the joy of each will be full. Christ will be known as their redemption, their righteousness and their life.

The value of the Atonement once perfected on the Cross will then be *fully* proved by them. The blood of the Holy One shed in death was at once the witness that the great Surety had fully borne the

Digitized by Google

appointed wrath, and that He had fully perfected and sacrificially presented the appointed obedience. Whilst "made a curse" and bearing the veritable wrath of God in the stead of His believing people, He did at the same time give Himself for them, "an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." The sin-offering "burnt up" without the camp, and the burnt offering "burned" on the altar, present us with different aspects of Christ's death, but they are both combined in the one sacrifice. Although the sin-offering was itself "*burnt up*" without the camp, yet its fat was burnt for fragrance on the altar. "Jehovah smelled a sweet savour." Thus the excellency of Christ's obedience in life and in death, and the value of all that He was as the sin-bearing Sufferer, was sacrificially presented for us on the Cross as on an altar, and under the full value of the imputation thereof all believers stand. "By the obedience of One" we are "constituted righteous." *By working out a righteousness for us on earth*, He hath become "the Lord our righteousness;" and the righteousness so provided is the ground of our acceptance and blessedness alike in time and in eternity. We are blessed not on the ground of any personal change wrought in us or on us, but solely on the ground of a righteousness provided for us by the obedience and suffering and death of another, even of Immanuel—God manifest in the flesh. Hence in the offering of the Cross we find "redemption." We are redeemed

Digitized by Google

from wrath and redeemed *unto* God. There, too, we find "righteousness," for all the claims of God have been met by the obedience consummated in the one finished oblation of the Cross. Therefore God is able to recognise us as right in relation to the claims of His *judicial* Courts. We are found to be and pronounced to be "*en règle*" in relation to the requirements of those Courts. We find in the Cross "sanctification" also, for Christ having given Himself for us as an offering and sacrifice to God of a "sweet-smelling savour," the sanctity of that oblation is reckoned to us, so that we draw nigh into the Courts of God's worship—His Temple-Courts, under the imputation of the holiness of the oblation offered on the Cross. Incense fills the sanctuary, and we stand under its fragrance. Therefore we read, "*sanctified* by the offering of the body of Jesus once," "Sanctified by His blood." Christ is made unto us wisdom from God, both "righteousness and *sanctification*, as well as redemption."

But whilst the saints individually and collectively, are thus filled with all fulness in Him; there will also be awarded to each, the individual meed of grace. Each will be placed before the tribunal* of

---

* I have used the word tribunal in preference to judgment-seat, because less liable to misapprehension—the thought commonly connected with judgment-seat being that of arraignment as a criminal.

Indeed the thought of criminal arraignment *ought* to be connected with the "great white Throne," before which the

Digitized by Google

Christ—not to be judged (he that believeth shall not come into judgment κρίσις, John v.), but to be re-

---

wicked dead raised at the close of the millennium will stand, to be judged out of things written in books according to their works. This is strictly judgment (κρίσις); but it is said that he who believeth shall not come into judgment (κρίσις). (See John v. 24). All who have believed in Jesus previously to His return, will be raised in the first resurrection, and will reign with Him during the millennium: consequently, they will not stand before the great white Throne at all. Nor will the saints who live during the millennium stand before it to be arraigned, because the Book of Life will be opened, and their names will be found written there. Consequently, they too will not come into judgment (κρίσις). The prayer of every saint, in every dispensation must be, "Lord, enter not into judgment with Thy servant; for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified."

But although the saints are not to be brought before this judgment-seat of Christ to be arraigned, they are to stand before the tribunal of Christ to "give account" of their past services and ways, in order that He may discriminate between that which is precious in those ways, and that which is worthless—and, having already forgiven them the evil, may reward them for that which is good. Thus, the victorious General of old, was accustomed, at the close of a campaign, to call his soldiers before his tribunal, not to arraign them, but to enquire into their conduct, and to reward them.

There is one passage in 2 Cor. v. 10, which seems to teach that believers will stand before the tribunal of Christ, to receive *according to* that which they have done, whether good or bad; in which case, saints would receive *according to* their evil. But the passage, rightly translated, does not teach this. It does not state that the saints are to receive *according to* that which they have done, but *with reference to* (προς) that which they have done. If a parent, at the close of the day, were to call his children before him, in order to enquire into their conduct, and after pointing out to them those things which they had done amiss, were to say, "These are things which, although I forgive them, I cannot reward; but these other things which are praise-

Digitized by Google

warded—to receive from Him, recognition of all that He can recognise for praise, in their past services and ways. Then the cup of cold water will be remembered—then it will be seen, that he who has received a Prophet in the name of a Prophet, shall receive a Prophet's reward, and that he who

---

worthy, I will reward"—in such a case, the children would receive *with reference to* what they had done, but they would not receive *according to* that which they had done.

It would appear, from the close of the twenty-fifth of Matthew, that those who are found professing the name of Christ at His return, will instantly be separated by the Angels into two bodies; according to the reality or falseness of their profession. After having been thus divided, they will be placed for a short moment before the Throne of His glory in the air, in order that the evidences of the one being His people, and the other not being His people, might be declared, and the one be rejected, the other received. But although the sentence that consigns the one to misery, and the others to blessedness, is openly pronounced; yet the goats are not then finally judged, nor the sheep definitely rewarded. The first are, at the close of the millennium, to be placed before the Great White Throne, to be judged according to their works—the latter are to stand before the Tribunal of Christ to be rewarded. The separation therefore of the sheep and goats is not strictly a judgment scene. It is merely the public declaration of that principle, which is already every day acted on by the Lord, in consigning some to the place of torment, where their souls are reserved for judgment, and in taking others to Himself in Paradise. This is not called judgment, although in a certain sense it is judgment. The ground of His thus acting is to be openly proclaimed by-and-by: but before that hour comes, He teaches us respecting it in this prophetic parable, in order that it may bear influentially on us throughout this dispensation. "Inasmuch as ye have done it to one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me."

Digitized by Google

has received a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, shall receive a righteous man's reward. To one it shall be said, Have thou authority over five; to another—over ten cities. This difference of reward is not inconsistent with each individual saint being made like unto Christ. The promise is not restricted which says—"when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." All shall "awake up in His likeness and be satisfied."

After these things the Heavenly City, which is one especial sphere of the saints' glory, descends from God out of Heaven. But although descending *from*, and therefore *contrasted with*, Heaven; yet it does not descend *into* the Millennial Earth. The Adamic Earth is not adapted to its glory. It remains therefore throughout the Millennium, *connected* indeed *with* the Earth, but not *in* the Earth; and it is not until the first Heavens and Earth have passed away and *new* Heavens and a *new* Earth created, that it descends again, and finds in the new Earth a place suitable for the habitation of its glory.

Its relation to Heaven and to the Earth during the Millennium, is analogous to that which the Holy Place occupied in the Temple. It was situate intermediately between the Holy of Holies and the external court where Israel worshipped. The Holy Place was the place of Priestly service, the place of intercession, the place where the golden Candlestick was set—the type of Christ, in that pure, perfect, un-

Digitized by Google

changing heavenly light, wherewith, whether in Earth or Heaven, He hath shone and ever shineth *for His people.* All this, and more, the Heavenly City will be. Thence the regulations of God's government, as well as the instructions of His grace, will reach Israel and the earth. "The nations shall walk by means of the light thereof, and the Kings of the Earth shall bring their glory and honour unto it." There, also, remedial means will be provided for meeting the exigencies of mortal life below. In the vision of the City were seen Trees of Life; and "the leaves of the Trees were for the healing of the nations."

The connexion of the power and glory of the New Creation with the circumstances of a fallen Earth, will thus be the great secret of Millennial blessing. This, indeed, is not a new principle in the works of God. The present condition of His saints affords an analogous example. Without changing their old natures, but allowing their flesh to remain flesh, He has been pleased to connect therewith that which is *new*—"the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" which also He sustains by the indwelling power of His own blessed Spirit. Hence, the repression of the evil that would otherwise be dominant in us, and the production of fruits of heavenly origin, where otherwise, all would be earthiness and corruption. But God, in bestowing blessing, is not satisfied with the mere repression of evil. All that is of the first Adam in us, whether

Digitized by Google

in body, soul, or spirit, is *finally* to pass away; and all is to be made new. Everything that is outward and everything inward in us, is to be brought into the likeness of Christ, according to the power of the new creation of God.

Throughout the Millennium, the frame-work of this lower world remains essentially unchanged. Although creation will no longer groan as now in the bondage of corruption, yet corruptibility and death will still remain in plants, and animals, and men. In men there will also be the presence of indwelling sin. But there will be a power of life operating from above—from Heaven, and from the Heavenly City, whereby the working of corruption, whether physical or moral, will be restrained, and the Earth be caused to teem with living blessing. This will especially be the case in the Land of Israel, which will then "be the joy of all lands."* "Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken: neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah: for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married." It would be impossible to quote all the passages, which speak of the fulness of blessing manifested, when once Israel and the Earth are regarded by God as taken possession of by the Lord Jesus in the title of redemption. All the Prophets and Psalms abound with descriptions of that hour.

---

* Extending then from the river of Egypt to the Euphrates.

Digitized by Google

Nor are these descriptions limited to outward blessings. The Psalms describe also, the peace, humility, and inward grace which will characterize Israel then. See, for example, such Psalms as the 131st: "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty: neither do I exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me: . . . my soul is even as a weaned child." And again, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity; it is . . . as the dew of Hermon, which descendeth on the mountains of Zion, for there Jehovah hath commanded the blessing, even life for evermore" (cxxxiii.). Then, too, they will say with deeper feeling than we, "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits; who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases" (ciii.). And again, "I will extol Thee, my God, O King, and I will bless Thy name for ever and ever. Every day will I bless Thee, and I will praise Thy name for ever and ever. . . . My mouth shall speak the praise of the Lord, and let all flesh bless His holy name for ever and ever" (cxlv.).

The imprisonment of Satan and his angels, the presence of the visible glory of Christ and His saints, the investiture of the Son of Man with the sovereignty of earth, the establishment of Jerusalem in a Church-position, as the pillar and ground of truth, its establishment also as the centre of govern-

Digitized by Google

mental influence throughout the earth, the release of creation from its groan, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh—these and other like things, will give to the millennial age a character, as contrasted with that of the ages that have preceded it, as the works of Christ are contrasted with the works of Satan. Christianity, although still militant, will cease to occupy the place of suffering and reproach. It will be no longer needful to go without the gate, bearing His reproach, because the city itself will be the place of righteousness and truth. The Church of the present Dispensation quits the wilderness, leaning, as one weak and exhausted, on the arm of the Beloved: but she is succeeded in her place of service and of testimony by another, who "looks forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." Israel will succeed into our place of testimony; but it will be a place no longer marked by weakness. Truth will be sustained by power, and surrounded by circumstances worthy of its essential excellency. Nevertheless, the servants of the truth, who yet remain in the flesh, will not be without their dangers. The pride and vain glory of man's nature will still remain in all except those who are glorified in heaven; and past experience teaches us, that hearts that have stood well through hours of adversity, have failed when brought under the sunshine of prosperity and joy. The preservation, therefore, of the saints of the coming dispensation, when sur-

Digitized by Google

rounded by circumstances of dignity, and rest, and glory, will be another instance of the *manifold* grace of God which is alike able to manifest its protective, preserving power whether they who are its objects be in lowliness, or in exaltation, in tribulation, or in triumph.

But however great the blessings of the millennial age, they still fall very short of the perfection of God. Sin, death, and occasional transgression, will yet be there, and *repressive* power (something unknown in heaven) will be perpetually needed, in order to prevent manifestations of evil, and sights of sorrow. The spirit therefore of the Millennial saints will long for something more perfect yet to come. They will be taught, even as we, to look for New Heavens and a New Earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. *

The distinctive characteristic of the Millennium therefore, is not to be found in the greatness of its blessings; for blessings higher and more abundant

---

* In Isaiah lxv. 17, 18, the subjects of joy and thanksgiving, presented to Israel at the commencement of their millennial blessing, are *two*—one future; the other, present. The final intention of God to create New Heavens and a New Earth, is *first* spoken of, and presented to them as an object of *hope:* next is mentioned, that which God will at that time be giving them, as a present joy; for at *that time* He will make Jerusalem and her people a joy.

"Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth," strictly—Behold, I, the Creating One of new heavens, &c. For this *abstract* use of the present participle as not defining time, see "Occasional Papers," No. II. page 96.

Digitized by Google

will be in the New Earth. The great distinctive characteristic of the Millennium is this, that it is the period when Christ assumes and exercises power in order to subjugate every enemy. This is the object avowedly proposed when Christ takes to Himself His millennial power. Its exercise is seen in the destructive judgments whereby the Millennium is commenced—in breaking up the evil systems of every nation throughout the earth—in punishing disobedience—in destroying the rebellious nations at the close of the millennial reign—in finally punishing Satan, and destroying Death. The subjugation of enemies is so distinctively the object of the millennial reign, that the power which Christ assumes for this purpose, He lays down as soon as it is accomplished. "Then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For He must reign, till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death. . . . And when all things shall have been subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv.). How wonderful therefore, that a dispensation whose distinctive characteristic is, power exercised for the subjugation of enemies, should be one distinguished also by blessings so transcendant that they seem to irradiate earth with the light and glory and happiness of heaven. Millions

Digitized by Google

too will be saved, who would have been lost for ever, if the history of man in the flesh had been made to terminate at the commencement and not at the close of the Millennium.

The Millennium, however, does not conclude, without affording another instance of the inveterate evil of the human heart. Unregenerate man can neither be gained by mercy nor subdued by terror. Unawed by the judgments that introduce the Millennium, and uninfluenced by the mercies that characterise its course, unwarned by the experience of preceding ages, and heedless of the lessons furnished by their own, the millennial Gentile nations,* as soon as Satan is again allowed to tempt, will instantly fall into the snare, and give themselves to him. They will deliberately assemble, in order to confront the visible glory of Christ, which they will long have known as present in the earth, and filling it with blessing. They know that Jerusalem is "the Beloved City," and Zion "the citadel of the saints," —they know that the glory of Christ is there; and yet none of these things will hinder the mad presumption of their evil. "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the citadel of the saints about and the beloved city; and fire came down out of heaven and devoured them" (Rev. xx. 9). Thus ends the earthly history of unregenerate

* The Gentile nations only will apostatize. Jerusalem and Israel will remain faithful to the Lord.

Digitized by Google

man. The general judgment follows: the dead are judged, and then He that sitteth on the throne will say: "Behold, I make all things new."

The glory of "The New Heavens and New Earth," we little apprehend. Even the present creation was made excellent and glorious. "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handywork: day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge." The sun in the firmament, and the lily of the field, alike declare the wisdom and the power of God. But all this creation, so wonderful and so glorious, was connected with one, who was of the earth—earthy: with *him* the heavens and the earth were created, and with *him* the heavens and the earth pass away.

If, then, a creation so glorious was connected with one who was of the earth—earthy, what will be the glory of that which is to be created in adaptation to Him who is the Second Man, the Lord from Heaven—a creation to be placed under His Headship, and to stand for ever in His blessedness? If we could estimate the difference between the person of Adam and the person of the Son of God, we might then appreciate the difference between the glory of the first, and the glory of the New Creation.

We are thus led on by Scripture to the first day of the completed blessing of the redeemed—the first day of their new history; when the Heavenly City, the Bride of the Lamb, descends into the New Earth.

Digitized by Google

She had not descended into the Millennial Earth.* She had been connected with it, and ministered to it; but she had not descended into it. She had been kept apart, as it were in holy separateness, until nothing should remain beneath, unsuited to her own purity and glory. The Heavenly Bridegroom had, throughout the Millennium, been exercising His power in order to subdue every enemy; and when that had been effected, and all things had been made new, she is introduced as His Bride into the new inheritance. How different the thoughts with which we contemplate the old, and the new history of man. The Scripture, which had commenced with the first day of his *first* history, concludes with the *first* day of this—his *new* history. We know not all that is beyond; but we know that He who hath made us for ever kings and priests unto God, has not restricted us even to the New Heavens and New Earth, but will give us to behold and to share His own glory above the heavens; and that He who is His Father, and our Father in Him, has promised to show, in the ages to come, the exceeding riches of His grace, in His kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. †

---

* It is very important to observe the difference between individual and corporate symbols. Individually the saints do visit the millennial earth, and act in it—but in their corporate glory, represented by the heavenly city, they do not enter in.

† The contrast between the *new* and the *first* earth; and between the *heavenly* and the earthly Jerusalem is so plainly

Digitized by Google

marked in Scripture, that it seems wonderful that it should have been overlooked by any. For example, it is expressly said, that "the first heavens and the first earth pass away, and no place is found for them," *before* the New Heavens and New Earth are created. In the New Earth, there is to be no sea—in the millennial earth, the sea is continually mentioned. In the new earth, there is no more sickness or death—in the millennial earth, remedial means are used against sickness and death; the last enemy is not destroyed until the close. In the New Earth, there is no sin, nor any liability thereunto—in the millennial earth, sin remains in the flesh of man; Satan can never enter into the new earth, nor into the Heavenly City: but he will re-enter the millennial earth, at the close of the Millennium, and will effect a great apostasy.

The contrast between the heavenly and the earthly Jerusalem during the Millennium, is no less marked. In the heavenly there is to be no Temple—but we read much of the millennial Temple of Israel. In the heavenly city, there is to be no succession of day and night. There shall be no night there. But whilst the first earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, day and night shall not cease.

Difficulty has been occasioned to some, by not observing that the ninth verse of Rev. xxi. should be made the commencement of a new chapter. The first *eight* verses of the *twenty-first* chapter, describe the relation of the heavenly city to the *new* earth—whereas, the subsequent part of the chapter *retraces*, and describes its relation to the *millennial* earth.

The *twentieth* chapter should commence at the *eleventh* verse of the *nineteenth* chapter—beginning "I saw heaven opened," and be continued to the end of the eighth verse of the *twenty-first* chapter: for the subject of all this passage is strictly consecutive. It begins by a vision of the glory of the heavenly Bridegroom, with which He is prepared to meet His enemies, and subdue the earth—next the destruction of Antichrist and his armies—then the binding of Satan—then the millennial reign—the concluding apostasy—the passing away of the first heavens, and the first earth—the judgment of the dead—the creation of the New Heavens and the New Earth, and the descent of the heavenly city into the new earth. These events are spoken of consecutively as they will really happen;

Digitized by Google

and therefore the passage which treats of them continuously, should of course be read as one chapter.

That the latter part of the 21st chapter after the 8th verse, and the commencement of the 22nd chapter refer to the relation of the heavenly city to the earth *during* the Millennium, is manifest from this, that means are thence employed for "the healing of the nations." In the new earth, there are no nations that need healing. The words, "and no curse shall any longer be," are of course to be restricted to the subject spoken of—that is, the heavenly city. They will not be applicable to the earth, until all in the earth is made like the heavenly city.

Digitized by Google

ROBT. STOCKWELL, Printer, Baden Place, Crosby Row, Borough, S.E.

ZECHARIAH V.

THE VISION OF THE EPHAH
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE
PRINCIPLES OF MODERN LEGISLATION.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON
C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.
PHONE - CLERKENWELL 6494.

1912.

Digitized by Google

Price 3d.

First Edition	.. ..	1851.
Second ,,	.. ..	1855.
Third ,,	.. ..	1862.
Reprinted in Second Edition of "Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms"		1873.

Digitized by Google

THE VISION OF THE EPHAH
OF
ZECHARIAH V.
CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE PRINCIPLES OF MODERN LEGISLATION.*

HOMO SUM, NIHIL HUMANI A ME ALIENUM PUTO †—a sentiment long since promulgated by a Roman poet, has, from that moment to the present, maintained its hold upon the heart of man, and received the approbation of successive ages. It embodies, indeed, a great truth—a truth recognized and acted on by God Himself—one to which the conscience, as well as the affections of every human bosom responds. Philanthropy—real philanthropy is one of the great principles of God. The proof is, the Incarnation and the Cross.

And as Christianity is not intended to stand aloof in heartless apathy, unmoved by that which is affecting the human family around, so the spontaneous impulse of the rightly-ordered Christian heart is to seek out, not that which it must differ from and condemn, but that which it can join with, sanction, and approve. One of the characteristics of a heavenly and perfected condition of being will be, that the interests and affections of the heart will unrestrictedly flow out to, and delight in, everything. There will be no need of restraint where everything is holy; no need of testimony *against* anything, where everything is worthy of being, what it will

* This paper was written in 1851.

† "I am a man—nothing that concerns man do I deem foreign to myself."

Digitized by Google

be—everlastingly blessed. Antagonism may be a duty, but in itself it affords no joy to the Christian heart. Apart from the painful personal consequences which it may involve, it is contrary to the law of our new nature, which desires fellowship—not conflict: nor could anything but the plain requirements of Truth reconcile us to the path of perpetual strife and contention, where we seem to employ ourselves in finding fault with everything, and earn for ourselves the character of a morose and fanatical misanthropy.

Would to God that we could truthfully say, that the tide of human things was flowing on in a course of real prosperity and blessing! It is a happy thing to share in the interests of others, and to unite one's activities with theirs. The very employment of our energies is a pleasure, when the course is right, and the end happy. It is painful, therefore—very painful, in observing the development of civilization and social progress in which all are exulting, to be obliged to condemn, and to say that this progress is connected with certain moral principles which will finally bring it under judicial visitation from the hand of God.

Few will question that the great Industrial gathering* which is about to take place in the metropolis of this country marks an era in human progress. There have been periods when assembled armies indicated the character of the power which chiefly swayed the nations. There have been other periods when assembled ecclesiastics have represented the dominant influence of the age. But such periods have passed away. If Russia were now to assemble her soldiers, or Rome her priests, neither would present a power so really potent—so really being,

* The Great Exhibition, 1851.

Digitized by Google

and about to be, the mainspring of the world's energies, as that assemblage which England has summoned to her shores. Accordingly, philanthropists are speaking of it as the indication of a power which is to regenerate the world; and even Christians are hailing it as the means by which the nations are to be knit together in amity and peace, and the millennial predictions of the Prophets fulfilled.

But surely the first thought that should be suggested to a Christian heart by such an assemblage, is, that it is *of the world*: and that which is of the world cannot be "of the Father." Whether it be a military, or an ecclesiastical, or a commercial spectacle that assembles men together, are not those so assembled essentially the world? Are not their habits of thought, and their practices such, that Christ's true principles, and doctrines, and laws, find no place among them? If it be so, how can a Christian view such an assemblage with complacency? How can he expect that it should result in overspreading the earth with Christ's truth, and with Christ's blessings?

Moreover, we have to remember that this is to be an assemblage marked by no ordinary characteristics. Never, since men first sought universal confederation on the plains of Shinar, when God interfered, and scattered them over the face of the earth—never since that hour has an assemblage been convened, so much resembling, in *some* of its features, that early gathering on the plains of Babel. It is true, indeed, that there is at present no intention of local centralization; but a thought of moral centralization *is* connected with this design. The Sun of human prosperity—the centre around which each part of the vast human system is to revolve—is supposed to be found in Commerce; and it

is hoped that this coming gathering will aid the advance of commerce until it shall unquestionably become the paramount influence of the day. Moreover, one great moral feature that marked the assemblage at Babel was, a desire to make themselves illustrious and mighty apart from God. This feature will not be wanting in the coming gathering of nations, for attainment of such greatness is the very idol of the hour.

As regards responsibility, the responsibility which attached to those who assembled at Babel was but as dust in the balance, compared with that which rests upon the nations who will now meet in England. When men assembled at Babel, and there attempted the union of their race, experience had not yet taught her lessons. Israel had not yet received their light; Prophets and Apostles had not spoken; Christ had not taught; Christianity had not yet been prostituted; nor Infidelity come forth, like a viper nourished in the bosom of religious corruption. But now, all these things *have* been, and we have to do with their results. The Jew will come, hardened in pharisaic rejection of Christ, or else tutored in the school of neologian latitudinarianism; the Eastern ecclesiastic will come, the type of the early corruption of Christian truth, and the witness of its present degradation; the Mohammedan will come, the representative of those who, mocking with bitter scorn the corruptions both of Judaism and Christianity, rushed with infidel fury upon both, and stamped out, as it were, the scattered and dying embers of Truth that lay smouldering in the midst of the fallen Churches; the Romanist will be there, as one who, by means of pretended Christianity, has led nations delivered from old idolatries back to idolatry again; Atheism, Deism, and all the various forms of Infidelity, will be there: Heathenism will be

Digitized by Google

there. Such will be the component parts of the vast multitude, which Commerce and Civilization are to "touch with their magic wand;" and finally binding them together in the bonds of philanthropic brotherhood, are to make them great, prosperous and happy. But will such brotherhood and such greatness be of God?

That England should be the spot chosen for such a development marks it with a fearful pre-eminence. England is, necessarily, a country interesting to all men, for it has filled no ordinary place in the world's history. But the reason why it peculiarly interests those who search the Scripture, is, not because it is a great nation merely, but because it belongs to a certain circle of the earth respecting which God has been pleased to prophesy very definitely in His Word. Two thousand five hundred years ago, when He first began to punish Jerusalem by subjecting it to the proud power of the Gentiles, He empowered the Prophet Daniel to give the prophetic history of certain Empires amongst whom civilization and power were to find their centre and their home, throughout the long period of Jerusalem's punishment. Chaldæa, Persia, Greece, following each other in quick succession, transmitted their empire to Rome, and the extent of the dominions of Rome mark the limits of what is called by writers on prophecy—the Prophetic Earth. This portion of the earth has for ages been known, both in the East and in the West as Ἡ Οἰκουμένη—ORBIS TERRARUM. The countries which fall within its limits will be the peculiar seat of the world's energies and greatness in the latter day—and England is one of those countries.

I need scarcely say, that to give the history of Chaldæa, Persia, Greece, and the Roman nations, is virtually to give the history of the world. Whatever enterprises

Digitized by Google

have been undertaken, whatever inventions made, or colonizations effected, they have either emanated from these nations as their centre, or, if in any case the place of origin has been external to their limits, these countries have soon succeeded in attracting towards themselves the results. The effects of civilization have ever gravitated, as it were, towards the Roman nations as their centre. God has so appointed that it should be.

Cain (in whose family the inventions of civilization first appeared), and then Babel, Chaldæa, Greece, Rome, are names which mark darkly the moral character of human civilization in this fallen earth. It has never moved as yet under the control of God. The giant idols which are now disinterred in Ninevah, the graves that are opened in Egypt, the fallen temples of Greece, and the ruined porticoes of Rome, all bear witness that the greatness of each of these nations has been directed against God. They all lifted themselves up against God, and He has withered them all. They have sunk beneath the blow of righteous retribution.

Civilization, having its birth-place in the East, in the regions which surround the Euphrates, moved, as Daniel had foretold, with steady progress towards the West. Greece became the place of its meridian splendour. From Greece it was transferred to Rome, and through Rome reached the limits of Europe in the West. But judgment followed in its track. Chaldæa, Asia Minor, Egypt, Greece, and at last Rome, were smitten; and only a few centuries ago it seemed as if civilization and power were likely to be driven from their ancient seats for ever, to find perhaps in another hemisphere a new sphere for their centralization and development.

But God has said that it should not be so. He has said that the Roman nations shall to the end continue

Digitized by Google

to be the centre of influence and controlling power in the earth—by the end, I mean the period when He will forgive Jerusalem, and restore her to supremacy again. Accordingly, after the fierce inroad of the Turks had overspread with ruin more than two-thirds of the Empire of the Cæsars, and when, by other influences, even Rome herself was reduced to a settlement of cowherds —grass growing in her palaces, and oxen pastured in her streets*—at that moment of dominant desolation, the Western corners of the Roman world, and, more especially, England, were permitted to become the rallying point of civilization ; the place where it has not only recovered its exhausted energies, but learned also to break ancient shackles, as well as to develop new powers.

---

* The following are the words of Ranke :—" During the absence of the Popes in Avignon, this Rome of the middle ages had sunk into equal decay with that ancient Rome which had so long lain in ruins. When Eugenius IV. returned to Rome in the year 1443, it was become a city of herdsmen ; its inhabitants were not distinguishable from the peasants of the neighbouring country. The hills had long been abandoned, and the only part inhabitated was the plain along the windings of the Tiber ; there was no pavement in the narrow streets, and these were rendered yet darker by the balconies and buttresses which propped one house against another : the cattle wandered about as in a village. From San Silvestro to the Porta del Popolo, all was garden and marsh, the haunts of flocks of wild ducks. The very memory of antiquity seemed almost effaced ; the Capitol was become the Goats' Hill, the Forum Romanum the Cows' Field ; the strangest legends were associated with the few remaining monuments. The Church of St. Peter was in danger of falling down."—*The Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes of Rome during 16th and 17th Centuries.* S. Austin's Translation, 1840, vol. i., p. 480.

Digitized by Google

Ecclesiastical tyranny had succeeded in binding many a fetter upon the hand of those wild nations that had broken in upon, and destroyed, the ancient Roman Empire. Priestcraft and degrading superstitions had, for the most part, effectually crippled all mental energy; and if any developed itself it was doomed, as in the case of Galileo, to the dungeon and to death. But in England during the reign of Henry the Eighth, ecclesiastical power, which under Wolsey displayed one great expiring blaze of brightness, suddenly sank. With Wolsey, ecclesiastical supremacy in England finally fell. Although Rome had not yet relinquished the hope of maintaining or restoring it in various countries, yet it may be safely said, that ever since the fall of Wolsey, principles have been in steady operation, chiefly through the instrumentality of England, which will finally deprive both Popery, and every other ecclesiastical system within the Roman World, not indeed of influence, but of *supremacy*. All those parts of Scripture which describe the future history of the Roman Kingdoms during the coming period of their revived, but unsanctified glory, distinctly speak of the secular power as supreme, and of the ecclesiastical as subordinate. In England it has long been so; and it is to this that England owes, in no slight degree, her present position of influence and strength.

That, however, which is *most* of all distinctive in the present condition of England, is her Commercial system. Commerce, or the wealth and influence thence arising, has become the mainspring of England's energies—the chief bulwark of her social institutions—the pillar of her government. When ecclesiastical power fell, and the feudal aristocracy became gradually enfeebled; and when the steady advance of the people seemed to make democracy (perhaps revolutionary democracy) the sure

Digitized by Google

end of the social movement, there was gradually being formed, in this country, a new aristocracy, more potent than any, whether ecclesiastic or hereditary, that had preceded—the aristocracy of wealth. The expressions, commercial interest; manufacturing interest; moneyed interest; Indian interest; and the like, suggest sufficiently intelligible ideas to English minds. The ramifications of these interests are so various and so extended, that the mass of society is effectually reached and controlled by their influence; and thus a power has been consolidated, the like to which has never before existed. The tranquillity with which England passed through the late period of European convulsion in 1848 is an evidence of the strength of this power. The State and its institutions consigned themselves to its protection, and rested quietly under its shield. In France no such consolidated power exists, and France has been shaken to her foundations.

In England this power is learning to work in harmony with the State. Indeed, the State has virtually become its organ. Plutocracy is a comprehensive, not an exclusive system. Its elasticity is great. It can adapt itself to the changing circumstances of the hour, and, receiving within its circle both the aristocrat and the democrat, it provides a place of honour and influence for both. In its relation to ancient systems it seeks, not to annihilate, but rather to modify, adapt, harmonize, and employ. It possesses, therefore, not only its own intrinsic weight, but is acquiring also all the weight which governmental authority can give. No other interest, whether royal or ecclesiastic, aristocratic or popular, is allowed to throw any effectual impediment in its course. Virtually, its will is paramount. The appropriate device of England would not be, either the crown or the mitre; the coronet

Digitized by Google

or the sword, but some emblem of Commerce. An "Ephah" should be emblazoned on her banners. Our government is a Commercial government, not because England happens to be a mercantile country, but because manufacturing and trading interests supremely sway her councils, and all other interests are being made subordinate. Such are the features which characteristically mark the period during which the powers of civilization have been renovated in this western corner of the Roman world. The abasement of ecclesiastical *supremacy*, the establishment of constitutional monarchy, and the rise of commerce into sovereign influence may be regarded as accomplished facts. They distinctively characterize England; and finally they will equally characterize every other kingdom that falls within the Roman World. The success of England naturally causes her to be imitated. Her influence, which is great, is exerted, as might be expected, for the propagation of her principles; and the circumstances of the hour favour these principles. We cannot marvel at this, for Scripture plainly declares that such shall be the principles of the closing period of our dispensation. Whatever opinion may be formed as to the particular City indicated in the eighteenth of the Revelation, this at least is evident, that that chapter describes a closing scene in the world's present history, and speaks of "merchants being the great men of the earth," and of a commercial city being "queen" of the nations.

Our first feeling when we review the rise of England's greatness, is commonly one of satisfaction and triumph. Civilization, we say, cannot be in itself wrong. It cannot be wrong to rejoice that the fetters of ecclesiastical and royal tyranny are broken. It cannot be wrong to develop the natural resources of the earth; to encourage

Digitized by Google

the inventions of science and art; to call forth the various powers of the human mind, and to employ its energies. All this may be true: but still the question recurs, Can the Christian rejoice in the means by which England has acquired her power, or in the principles she is adopting in its use? That question can only be answered by considering the governmental relation of England to God's revealed Truth.

When Protestantism struck off from England the shackles of Popery, the Bible was put into her hand, and for a season she seemed to rejoice in the gift. In her political conflicts with Popery she used it; but, as the dread of Popery lessened, the Bible was less and less regarded; until at length, ignorance and indifference so prevailed, that there have been few periods of deeper darkness than that which reigned in England during the greater part of the seventeenth and the commencement of the eighteenth century. In the meanwhile, various new forms of nominal Christianity, and at last Popery and Judaism, increased in political power: and when at length the theory of constitutional government was matured, and government (ceasing to stand between God and the people, as holding authority from Him) became avowedly the organ of the people's will, it was of course requisite that the acts of government should correspond with the relation in which it stood to the manifold varieties of Creed found among those whose will it had undertaken to express. This, of course necessitated latitudinarianism. All who were ambitious of power, found it needful to be officially, if not personally, latitudinarian.

But there were other influences, more potent even than these, tending to the same end. England and the merchants of England began to conquer, to colonize,

Digitized by Google

or to visit, all lands. They found these lands teeming with the various forms of idolatry and evil which the ingenuity of Satan had devised throughout the earth, in order to dishonour God, and to ruin souls. Has England taken her stand in the midst of these abominations, and given faithful testimony to the truth of the Word of God? Has she steadily and practically declared that there was one God and one Lord Jesus Christ —and has she carefully avoided rendering her aid to any except to those who simply preach the Gospel of the GRACE of God? No: she found it more expedient to conciliate than to testify; more advantageous to honour falsehood than to contend for Truth; and, therefore, she practically laid aside the Bible, and determined to sanction, whenever expedient, every creed alike. Accommodation to existing systems became her rule. Accordingly, she has presided over the priesthood of Buddha; offered gifts at the shrine of Juggernaut; flattered the Mohammedan in the East; honoured the idols of Popery in the West, endowed their Colleges, paid their Priests, and frowned upon all who have sought, in the midst of these things, to act aggressively for the Truth of God. In Ireland, especially, she has scowled upon the Truth, and upon its servants.*

---

* See facts stated in the late reply of the Bishop of Cashel to his Clergy. The administration of Ireland has afforded a fearful exhibition of reckless Latitudinarianism, and the doctrines lately avowed at Manchester show how completely the Commercial School have adopted similar principles. It is true that real Christianity may, and does, flourish more without the support of such, than with it; but this does not lessen the guilt of those who see no honour in assisting the distribution of the Holy Scripture, and no sin in crushing it, and delivering over the souls of the people to devouring priests.

Digitized by Google

There has been one individual (he too acted on by the love of influence) who has trodden a like path ; and that person, more than any one else in modern days, has foreshadowed the actings of the last great Antichrist—I mean Napoleon Bonaparte. Bonaparte, avowedly reckless about truth, and fearing neither God nor Satan, honoured, as it suited him, everything. In Holland, he pleased the Protestants ; elsewhere, the Pope. When meditating schemes of conquest in the East, he flattered the Jews ; and when in Egypt, acknowledged Mohammed. His Egyptian proclamations bear the Moslem motto—" There is one God, and Mohammed is His prophet : " and one is yet extant, in which he solemnly avers that he had received a commission from God to destroy the Cross, and to plant the Crescent in its stead. I do not say that England has, as yet, equalled this blasphemy ; but she has entered the same character of path. She has bowed before more idols than did Bonaparte, and that, after having been favoured with more light than he—for he was born in idolatry, and nurtured in atheism. The lust of extended power tempted *him* : the lust of extended commercial influence has seduced England. Some time ago, when England was charged with these things, her rulers seemed, in measure, sensible of their shame ; they pleaded necessity, and the like. But now we hear less of that plea ; now, it is openly said and written that the Bible is not intended to be used in human legislation, and Truth is declared to be a phantom too subtle for our grasp.

If the shackles of Popery had remained on England she could not have pursued her present path. Popery would not have permitted it. Popery would have forbidden her to follow a course that so compromised its own supremacy. But when human shackles are

removed, and not replaced by the golden chain of Christ's truth, the hand that is liberated is liberated only for transgression. England has ceased to be the slave of Popery, but her liberty is becoming the liberty of deistical forgetfulness of God.

It is true, indeed, that the course of the old ecclesiastical or Popish party, which is struggling to regain ascendancy, is at present opposed to these things. If we examine the present condition of society in England, if we observe the books they read, and watch the sentiments avowed by the pulpit and the press generally, we shall find that the influential principles of the day distribute themselves under one of two classes. They either lead back to the ecclesiastical corruption of past ages, or, under the pretence of philosophic superiority to prejudice, and philanthropic desire after peace, they lead to the apathy, if not to the activities, of latitudinarianism. If Dr Wiseman delights in the tyrannical uniformity (for we cannot call it unity) of Rome: we find, on the other hand, a professedly Protestant statesman delighting in the thought that his town presented the form of a happier unity, produced by negation of truth; for there he beheld Socinians, Dissenters, Churchmen—sects that once fiercely contended, content to forget their differences, and to live harmoniously together. If Dr Pusey and his Tractarian followers wish again to bind on governments and nations the ancient manacles of superstition and priestcraft, Lord Macaulay, on the other hand, and the Liberal writers of the day, whilst seeming only to break the bonds which man has imposed upon his fellow-man, break with them also the bonds which God's own hand has formed—assert that the Bible is no more to be regarded by the governor in governing that it is by the mechanic in making a

Digitized by Google

machine—ask scornfully whether any *certain* truth can be attained, and advocate principles which, when they have taken their full effect, will cause the nations to say, both of Jehovah and of Christ, "Let us break their bonds asunder, and cast away their cords from us" (Ps. ii. 3). The advocates of modern Liberalism point, and not without reason, to the Exhibition of 1851 as the symbol of their principles—benign, they say—philanthropic—fraternal. But are their principles at all nearer God than the principles of those, the symbols of whose creed are found in cloisters, cathedrals, and priests? Are they not even more distant? Yet, doubtless they will attain supremacy; for they knit together the units of mankind on *natural* principles, without constraining any to forego their individual peculiarities; and when that supremacy has fully been attained, we shall see even Popery herself abating her pretentions, and falling as a handmaid (and an honoured handmaid) into the train of her mighty Mistress.

Would that I could see in the "Exhibition" the symbol of a power that had, benignly indeed, but firmly, entered all lands with the oracles of God in its hand—refusing fellowship with corruption, whether found in the darkness of heathenism or the abominations of pretended Christianity; and seeking to encourage all who should declare to a lost world, that God was ready, through the *finished* work of the Lord Jesus, to accept, in His name, the perishing sinner—to forgive him freely and to clothe him with the robe of Christ's righteousness for ever! Would to God that England, Protestant England, had thus traversed the nations—that she had marked well the difference between Judaism, Mohammedanism, Popery (which all talk of God and obedience to God), and Christianity, which testifies not only of God

and God's *righteousness*, but of His GRACE abounding where sin hath abounded—imputing righteousness without works—justifying freely, through faith, on the sole ground of the imputation of the righteousness of ANOTHER. "We are reputed righteous before God ONLY because of the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by means of faith, not because of our own works or deservings."—Eleventh English Article.* Would that she had imitated her first true Protestant King, and judged it to be her chief honour to exalt the Word of the living God against the traditions of men, to find out Christ's servants and to help Christ's truth! But alas! her course has been far otherwise. She has ignored Christ's Gospel; she has found it convenient to strengthen Christ's enemies; her conscience seeks relief from the sin in the easy doctrines of latitudinarianism; she calls it charity; and whilst confirming those systems, which like so many iron barriers keep the nations from the bread of life, she amuses them by a display of earthly riches (things for the sake of which she has virtually sacrificed their souls), and by asking them to behold her greatness, invites them to adopt her principles—principles whereby Truth perishes. Let any Christian think of these things, and rejoice in the "Exhibition" if he can!

The seeming innocency of the spectacle will doubtless deceive many. It stands apparently in very advantageous contrast with other forms of the earth's greatness. Armies of warriors, or armies of priests might terrify us. They remind us of bloodshed and death; of the chains

---

* "Tantum propter meritum Domini et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur."

Digitized by Google

of the conqueror, or of the racks and fires of the Inquisition. But Commerce seems only to hold forth the olive branch of peace, and beneficently to subserve the necessities of human life. Few care to distinguish between Commerce and the *principles* Commerce may adopt; and whilst enjoying the results of the former, willingly forget to enquire respecting the latter.

There is a remarkable prophecy in the Book of Zechariah (a prophecy distinctly unfulfilled) which bears very closely on the circumstances of which we speak. The object of the vision shown to Zechariah is to instruct respecting the character of the influence which shall be dominant over Israel, and over the nations at the closing period of their evil history. It reveals where the master-power shall reside, which, in the latter days, shall "go forth" with pervading influence, to control the energies of the earth. And what is the symbol of this power? It is not a sceptre, nor a sword, nor a mitre, but it is an Ephah. "Then the angel that talked with me went forth, and said unto me, Lift up now thine eyes, and see what is this that goeth forth. And I said, What is it? And he said, This is AN EPHAH that goeth forth." An Ephah is the symbol of Commerce. There is to be a period, therefore, during which Commerce is to rule the earth; a period when an Ephah might fitly be emblazoned on the banner of each Kingdom of the Roman World as the device best suited to indicate where the secret of its influence lay. "This," said the angel, speaking of the Ephah—"This is their eye (עינם)* through all the earth."

* This word literally means "*eye*;" thus the Vulgate "Hæc est oculus eorum in universâ terrâ." "Eye" may either mean *aspect, appearance*,—as in Numbers xi. 7, where it is said of the manna, that "the colour or appearance thereof was as the colour

In the outward appearance of the Ephah there was nothing to terrify. Men have learned to dread the sceptre, the sword, and the mitre; but the Ephah presents an aspect than which nothing can be more innocent or peaceful. The Prophet, however, was commanded to look again. A heavy weight of lead rested as a lid or covering on the mouth of the Ephah. The Angel raised it, and directed the Prophet to look within. He looked within, and beheld a Woman sitting in the midst of the Ephah. A Woman, when used symbolically, is in Scripture the emblem of a moral system. When we speak of the reign of Commerce, we do not mean merely that commercial activities are to be increased, and that the nations will begin to trade one with the other more energetically; but we mean that the influence of those whose commercial wealth enables them to touch and control the secret springs of government will be directed to the sustainment of certain *formed* principles—political, educational, religious, and the like—as definite and precise as any which have heretofore characterized Popery, or any other similar system.

---

of bdellium "—or, "eye" may mean that to which we look for guidance, favour, or any supply of blessing. This, no doubt, is its meaning here. If the eye of a father or friend rest benignly on us, we look to its kindness as a source of supply to all our requirement. Hence "eye" is continually used of fountains in the wilderness, and wells of water. See Gen. xvi. 7. Also Deut. xxxiii. 28: "Israel then shall dwell in safety alone; the fountain (literally *eye*) of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine; also his heavens shall drop down dew." Thus we have to contrast the "eye" of unbelieving Israel and the nations, *viz.*, the Ephah in the land of Shinar, with "the eye" of forgiven Israel in the land of Emmanuel, when Jehovah shall be their strength and their song.

Digitized by Google

If old principles are abandoned, new principles must be supplied in their stead, or else the world must be left ungoverned: and as these new principles are formed and brought into operation, so, of course, a new system of moral agency is created. For example, it was once taught as a principle that all power was from God; and it was deemed a kind of Atheism to teach that the people were its source: but now the latter principle reigns, and the former is utterly abjured. Once it was thought fit to maintain the truth of Holy Scripture, so far as to refuse to sanction idolatrous and corrupt religions; but now such sanction is freely and systematically given. Once it was thought desirable to encourage those who circulated the Word of life; but, now, they who circulate it in some of the districts where it is most needed are crushed, and their enemies honoured. The Bible was once thought to contain principles which it was the duty of the Governor to recognize; but now the Bible, in legislation, is to be ignored. It was once thought that all right fraternity must be based on Scripture; but now fraternization, apart from Truth, is to be the panacea of the world's disorders. It was once thought that the ruler should encourage Truth where he discerned it; now he is not to believe that certain Truth is anywhere to be discovered. Such are some of the principles. It is impossible that they can be adopted without a system being formed, as definite, and probably more definite, than any of the systems which it supersedes.

The vision, however, plainly indicates that this system is formed secretly, for it is represented as *hidden* in the Ephah. And nothing can be more true. Sheltering itself under the excuse of expediency, this nation, which more than any other owns the sway of the Ephah, has secretly and stealthily adopted principles which it is

still ashamed to avow as the fixed acknowledged rule of its conduct. Many a sentiment has dropped from the lips of legislators and statesmen, which, although welcomed by multitudes, and acted on, have not yet become the recognized principles of the State. Who, for example, would dare to enter on the Statute-Book of England that tribute should be paid to Juggernaut; all Mohammedan festivals honoured; Popish priests duly paid; Protestant testimony, in certain spheres, forbidden? Who would at present dare to propose that it should be registered as a principle amongst England's laws, that Truth cannot be ascertained; that the Bible is not to be regarded in legislation; that all religions have in them a measure of truth, and that consequently all may, without sin, be encouraged? It is but lately that the voice of the Dragon has ventured to mutter this last sentiment in our ears, and no one just at present would dare to claim for it public authorization. These, and such like principles, separately and cautiously enounced, and slowly becoming systematized under the protection of Commercial power, are at present a kind of "mystery" hidden. The time has not yet come for them to be presented to the world in a systematized and ordered form, nor, indeed, are they as yet brought into that form: but when that time does come, they will no longer remain a "mystery" *hidden:* they will be seen in the manifested, displayed attractiveness of the scarlet Harlot of Babylon. Her *hidden* existence in the Ephah precedes her *manifestation* "IN THE LAND OF SHINAR."

As soon as the leaden lid was removed from the mouth of the Ephah, the Prophet beheld the Woman, who had been hidden within it, preparing to spring up from her imprisonment. But she was not permitted to arise, the angel, exclaiming "This is Wickedness" (*ἀνομία*), thrust

Digitized by Google

her down into the midst of the Ephah and " cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof." Thus " Wickedness " was hidden within the Ephah. " Wickedness," when thus definitely used in prophetic Scripture in relation to the closing events of our dispensation, is a word of very precise meaning. " The Wicked One " is, both in the Old and New Testaments, the designative appellation of " The Antichrist." Compare רשע of Isaiah xi. 4, and ὁ ἄνομος of 2 Thess. ii. 8. " Wickedness," therefore, as used in this passage, is a word that expresses the fulness of those principles of lawless evil that will finally be embodied in Antichrist, and make him what he will be. But Antichristianism exists before Antichrist. That system of lawless Infidelity to which he will ultimately give full effect, becomes a formed, though not a manifested system, during the time that Commerce is advancing to her place of sovereignty. When the time comes for that sovereignty to be displayed, and the Ephah be transferred to its resting-place in the land of Shinar, then the Woman shall be no longer hidden. Then she shall be displayed in all her attractiveness as the Harlot of Babylon, and Antichrist, for a season, will become her servant and her minister. We cannot marvel that Antichrist, personally, should at last be sent as a scourge upon nations that have deliberately adopted for their own advantage the principles of a practical Deism.

How long this system will remain *hidden* in the Ephah we are not told. Its *manifestation* will certainly, I believe, follow, not precede, the return of Israel, in unbelief, to their own land. Whenever the religious systems of the Roman World—Judaism, Mohammedanism, Romanism, and the like, shall unite with one another, and with the secular Governments in adopting this system, then, with every influence favouring, it will

be transferred from the place of its origin to the Euphratean countries—the earliest home of civilization—and there be established. *There* the Woman of the Ephah will be displayed as the Harlot of the Revelation, admired by all, delighted in by all, giving the cup of joy and gladness to all nations—wine that will gladden for a season, but the wine of everlasting wrath. Into these things, however, as I have elsewhere considered them very fully, I do not now enter.* I will only observe that this administration of the cup of gladness is very distinctive of this last System. Previous systems, such as Popery, have been oppressive, and caused sorrow; they have bound heavy burdens and grevious to be borne, and have been anything rather than dispensers of universal joy.

The course which England has, for many years, been governmentally pursuing, tends steadily towards the end which the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters of the Revelation delineate. England is silently, but efficiently acting on all the countries of the Roman World by negation of Truth, and by an idolatrous devotion to the "material interests" of men—thus paving the way for the advent of that system which is to reign in the Harlot City. Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, are all feeling the effects of England's influence. Israel, too, will soon be added to the list. They also will join the system that deifies civilization and ignores Truth; and then the end will quickly come. "The Exhibition of 1851" is the exponent of a power which is silently effecting these things.†

* See "Babylon and Egypt" and "Thoughts on the Apocalypse," as advertised at end.

† The reaction towards Romanism which has taken place in England, has, to a certain extent, impeded the progress of pure Latitudinarianism. It is a hindrance that will operate for a

Digitized by Google

As regards the various degrees of responsibility attaching to those who are leading, or being led in these paths, I say nothing. There is One only who can determine to whom responsibility attaches, and in what proportion. We have to remember, however, that it attaches to the *people* of this country, more, perhaps, than to its Governors; for the theory of modern Government is, that the Governor is the servant, not the master, of the popular will. The hour of "civil and religious liberty" proves the truth of its pretensions, by so fettering the hand of the Sovereign that she can neither governmentally maintain the sole supremacy of the Word of God, nor refuse to pay and honour the ministers of a system at which

---

time, but for a time only. It is necessary to the full establishment of Latitudinarianism that dominant religious influences should be so far neutralized as to be deprived of their dominancy. Thus the ancient dominancy of Mohammedanism is being destroyed in the East by the introduction of other influences. So also in Spain, Italy, and France, the dominancy of Popery is departing. In England, where Protestantism has ruled, the dominancy of Protestantism is being destroyed, and Puseyism (as it is called) is one of the instrumentalities by which this is being effected. But, apart from the temptations of self-interest, no man of intelligence or character has long consented to be the tool and slave of Ecclesiasticism. Self-interest is now leading men in another path. The exclusiveness of Sacerdotalism, even if men were not disgusted by the transparency of its falsehoods, is ill-suited to the temper of the present hour. Ecclesiasticism may become Latitudinarian, but Latitudinarianism will not resign the throne to Ecclesiasticism. But whilst Ecclesiasticism and Latitudinarianism are thus warring, even as the Pharisees and the Sadducees did of old, we must remember that it was said unto both, "*O generation of vipers*, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" May it be remembered, before it is too late, that the one way of salvation as declared in Scripture, through faith in the one finished Sacrifice, is alike rejected by the Ritualist and the Latitudinarian.

Digitized by Google

her conscience trembles. Practically, however, it often happens that individual Governors, by force of skill and talent, sway the minds of the people, so as to mould the spirit of the age. On such, of course, the deepest responsibility rests. There may be some, however, who, like Darius, when he prayed for the liberation of Daniel, feel overpowered by circumstances too strong for them, and yield because they fear to resist. To yield is indeed not weakness merely, but sin; nevertheless, the heart of Darius was not so far from God as that of those who constrained him into a path in which *their* hearts indeed delighted, but which *his* heart and *his* conscience abhorred. Such, of course, plead no necessity in excuse, for they acknowledge no sin. They are not like Naaman, who confessed that it *was* a sin to bow in the temple of Rimmon, and meekly asked forgiveness; on the contrary, they exult in their principles; and if they remember God at all, they declare that they are honouring him, and doing Him and His creatures service. Can there be any remedy for blindness such as this?

Some, perhaps, will say, that it is better for the people of God to dismiss all questions respecting the world and its government, and to concern themselves only with those things which immediately affect their own condition. It is true, indeed, that it would be most wrong for the servants of Christ to quit their own peculiar sphere and to attempt the government of nations; but it is not wrong for them to search the Scripture, that they might be able to admonish and advise all men according to the truth therein revealed. To admonish and warn is their *duty*. Both Prophets and Apostles have testified many things concerning the nations, their prospects, and their end: and are the servants of Christ to quench that light, or to

Digitized by Google

put it under a bushel? In that case their own condition will soon become fatally affected. They will soon begin themselves to stumble. He who at the midnight hour casts away his torch and buries himself in darkness may have a seeing eye, but, practically, he is little better than the blind; and whether the blind be led by the blind, or by those who have thus darkened themselves, matters little as to all present consequences. They must both grope in darkness, and nothing but undeserved sovereign grace could prevent either the leaders or the led, from falling into the ditch at last. Present facts justify the strength of my expressions. Many who profess to lead in the paths of Christ are speaking of this gathering as being a kind of second Pentecost, and request that it may be remembered in prayer as one of the great instruments whereby God intends to accomplish His work of final blessing on the earth.*

---

* "Electricity is not an insulated jar, geology is not a mere boulder on the earth, astronomy is not a lofty and lone observatory, music is not a mere solo strain, poetry is not a mendicant minstrel, art is not a solitary tradesman set up for himself; but a grand unity binds them all in one, bringing them day by day to be more and more the echo of the Christian's anthem—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.' Steam and lightning are not secular, but Divine powers. They are inspirations from on high, preparing the way of the Lord. All science, worthy of the name, is either a messenger to man proclaiming God, or a servant coming down from God to prepare the way of the Lord. All the sciences, like the Magi of old, will come not only to the cradle, but to the Cross of our exalted Redeemer."—*Dr Cumming's God in Science*, p. 40.

"There is before us an Exhibition connected with science. I rejoice, I must say, in spite of the prophecies of some, in the prospect of that noble evidence of peace and harmony among mankind. It seems to me a very noble idea, and such I pray that it may prove to be, being a lover of science as I am, next to

How little would the heart of John in Patmos have responded to such thoughts as these! He was set there, not to prophesy peace to the nations—not to bid them "God speed" in their evil course, but to prophesy *against* them, to predict their impenitency and final doom: and his prophecy, be it remembered, is not yet spent, for it is terminated only by the Coming of the

---

a lover of my Bible—I pray to God that it may fulfil the promises of the sanguine, not the vaticinations of those who augur ill. It will teach us Britons, perhaps, to be more humble, and to cease from measuring ourselves by ourselves, which the Apostle says is not wise. It may be a contribution to the peace of nations, by showing a nobler rivalry than arms, better trophies than banners and garments rolled in blood, and a warfare whose field is the Crystal Palace in Hyde Park—whose artillery are steam engines and hydraulic presses—whose soldiers are philosophers, and engineers, and spinners, and dyers—and its protocols treatises on science, and its traces good feeling, amicable rivalry, and social and universal advancement. Such great movements have always been connected with the elevation and progress of mankind. It was when the Medes and Parthians and dwellers in Mesopotamia—and I speak it with a deep sense of the solemnity of that event—were all assembled at Jerusalem, that the Holy Spirit came down, and made them the ambassadors of God and the benefactors of mankind. It may be, that during this great assembly of the nations of the earth, of Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, bond and free, God may have in store unknown to us—I pray that it may be so—social blessings that the world shall not be able to exhaust. It may be a new era. At all events, we may feel persuaded that multitudes will witness here what they never dreamt of. Muftis and Sultans may return to Constantinople, to make known what Christianity has done—for it alone has done it—for this great land of ours. Yes; despots and tyrants from afar may go home to their capitals, never to forget the impression of liberty without license, loyalty in the subject without despotism in the ruler, the omnipotence of law, the majestic might of order, of harmony, and of peace."—*Dr Cumming's God in Science*, p. 42.

Digitized by Google

Lord in glory. If we shrink from or scorn the Patmos-place of testimony; if we refuse to eat the bitter book of prophecy—"sweet in the mouth, but in the belly bitter"; if we will *not* maintain the truth of the words that he prophesied "against (ἐπί) many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings," we forfeit the place of honour which God's mercy assigns to us in the great battle-field of Truth, and shall probably be permitted so to mistake His foes for His friends, that our energies will be spent in cheering on His adversaries in their last assaults on all that He counts precious in the earth.

It is marvellous how readily mercies and words of mercy are, in the thoughts of men, separated from Him, through whom and by whom these mercies come. Men, for example, like to be reminded of the words, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will towards men:"* and some have proposed that they should be multiplied in ten thousand various forms of inscription in every known language of the earth, and placed on all

---

* The words which the angels really sang were, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth the peace of complacency (or well-pleasedness) in the midst of men" ἐν ἀνθρώποις.

As commonly understood, these words are regarded as expressing nothing more than God's kindness and beneficence towards all His creatures. We have indeed to thank and praise Him for that beneficence. Truly He is good to all and His tender mercies are over all His works. He hath "so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." But the words which the angels sang express something different from this. They speak of something being found in *the midst of men*, in which God could rest in satisfied complacent peace. In the midst of the darkness of earth One stood, around whom a circle of heavenly light was drawn. Of Him God could say, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (εὐδόκησα). "The peace of

Digitized by Google

the arches of that vast edifice, which is now being builded as the Tabernacle—the Congregation-place—of all nations. Men love to hear these words, but do they remember the earth's present relation to Him over whom those words were sung? Have the nations repented of their rejection of Him—of their persecution and corruption of His Truth? Have they fled to Him and to His blood for refuge? Have they confessed His name, and gathered round the banner of His Truth? Has the Jew done this, or the Mohammedan, or the Romanist, or the Heathen, or the Infidel? Has England remembered Him, owned His servants, favoured His Truth, or is she ready to barter it all away—to sell it for influence and for gain? Perhaps the words which the angels sang may be sung again: perhaps they may again herald Christ's return unto this earth; for when God "again bringeth the First begotten into the world," He will say, "Let all the angels of God worship Him" (Heb. i. 6). Would the nations welcome these words so employed, or would they be as words of thunder in their ears, awakening the wail of everlasting anguish?

We have indeed reason to thank God as we remember these things, that He is pleased still to continue in the earth the message of His GRACE. Whilst His Holy Word exposes and denounces the path which the nations tread, it speaks also of a refuge: it proclaims a fountain opened

---

well-pleasedness" (εἰρήνη εὐδοκίας) was in the midst of men, because Jesus was in the midst of men. A circle of acceptance, and peace, and love, was drawn around Him; and all who by faith were brought within that circle, were received within that circle, and were rested in with "the peace of well-pleasedness." The being objects of this complacency is something very different from being the objects of kindness and beneficence merely, and is the portion of believers only.

Digitized by Google

for sin and for uncleanness in the blood of the Lamb. There God receives the humbled sinner, receives him in his guiltiness, asks from him no character (for he has none to bring), justifies him freely, imputes to him righteousness without works, accepts him in the Beloved. Have we not then reason, whilst we consider the abounding evil, to thank Him that the master of the house has not yet risen up and shut to the door ?—although the hour now draweth near, when it will be finally said, " He that is unrighteous let him be unrighteous still."

The last book of Scripture, which more than any other is concerned with the closing scene of the world's evil, and which chiefly sets God's holiness in contrast therewith, does not conclude without the fullest and most explicit testimony to the freeness of GRACE. " The Spirit and the Bride "—names whose holiness stands in living contrast with the earth's abominations—" the Spirit and the Bride," holy though they may be, nevertheless say, " Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Blessed words of grace, when we think of that coming Day of visitation !

Not one, be it remembered, of the Old Testament prophecies which speak of the coming of the day of the Lord is as yet fulfilled. " The Day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up ; and he shall be brought low : and upon all the cedars of Lebanon that are high and lifted up, and upon all the oaks of Bashan, . . . and upon all the ships of Tarshish, and upon all pleasant pictures. And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be made low : and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. . . . And

Digitized by Google

they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His majesty, when He ariseth to shake terribly the earth" (Is. ii.). Chapter after chapter in the Old Testament speaks in language similar to this; and when we turn to the New Testament, the closing book of prophecy there describes the last great City of human greatness—that City which is especially to evidence what modern Civilization and Commerce are able to effect. We read of "the merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble"—in a word, all that modern art and science are able to effect in developing the resources of the earth, and making them available for the purposes of man, will be developed in that great City. "Her merchants" are to be "the great men of the earth, waxing rich through the abundance of her delicacies" (Rev. xviii.). But what is to be the end of these things? Is this is the City of which it shall be said, "Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon *thee*"? Is this the City that "shall call her walls Salvation and her gates Praise"?—or is the word of the Lord *against* her, saying, that she shall be "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird:" and that they who rejoice in her are to wail the wail of everlasting anguish, when the Alleluias of Heaven are sung over her destruction? "The sovereignty of the world" will then, at last, "become the sovereignty of our Lord and His Christ," and "He shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously." "Therefore wait

Digitized by Google

ye upon Me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for My determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them Mine indignation, even all My fierce anger, for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of My jealousy. For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent" (Zeph. iii. 8). Civilization will cease then to be the servant of pride, and shall no longer ripen the nations for destruction.

It is true, few, very few, believe these things. Even Christians are falsely prophesying peace, and encouraging the nations in their prosperous course of ruin. Man's expectations are found increasingly at variance with the predictions of God. But which shall we follow—the words of men, or the testimonies of the living God?

Digitized by Google

ZECHARIAH V. RE-TRANSLATED.*

And I turned and lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and lo! a roll flying. 2. And he said unto me, What seest thou? And I said, I see a roll flying; the length thereof is twenty cubits, and the breadth thereof ten cubits. 3. And he said unto me, This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole land; for every one that stealeth, on the one side, according to it hath been declared innocent; and every one that hath sworn, on the other side, according to it hath been declared innocent. 4. I have caused it to go forth, saith Jehovah of hosts, and it hath gone to the house of the thief and to the house of him that sweareth in My name to a falsehood, and it hath lodged in the midst of his house, and it hath consumed it with its timber and its stones.

5. Then the angel that spake with me went forth; and he said unto me, Lift up I pray thee thine eyes, and see that which goeth forth. 6. And I said, What is it? And he said, This is the going-forth Ephah. And he said, This is their aspect in all the land. 7. And behold a talent of lead lifted up; and this is a woman—one *woman* that sitteth in the midst of the Ephah. 8. And he said, This is Lawlessness. And he thrust her down into the midst of the Ephah; and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof.

---

* This Re-translation, together with the succeeding Notes, first appeared in "Thoughts on Scriptural Subjects," Second Edition, 1896.

Digitized by Google

9. And I lifted up mine eyes and saw, and behold two women coming forth; and the wind was in their wings, and they had wings like the wings of a stork; and they lifted up the Ephah between the earth and the heavens.

10. And I said to the angel that spake with me, Whither are these conducting the Ephah? 11. And he said unto me, To build her a house in the land of Shinar; and when it is established she shall become settled there upon her own base.

Digitized by Google

NOTES ON ZECHARIAH V.

Verse 2. As regards the length and breadth of the roll (twenty cubits and ten) it is worthy of note that the porch in Solomon's Temple, and the holy place in the Tabernacle, had the same measurement. See 1 Kings vi. 3, and Exodus xxvi. 15, 23. This no doubt typically teaches that the influence that once proceeded from Solomon's Temple, etc., for Truth and for God, will be in the now nearly approaching hour, succeeded by a similarly pervasive influence for falsehood and the devil. This will be as soon as the woman mentioned in the concluding part of the chapter shall have been established in the land of Shinar.

We find it declared in other parts of Scripture that the misery and wickedness both denoted by עמל (*mischief*) in Ps. xciv. 20, will be established by law or by a decree. "Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with Thee, which frameth mischief by a law?" or statute. This verse belongs to a period when Antichristianism and Antichrist will reign; the word translated *iniquity* (הוות) is a very strong expression, elsewhere rendered *mischievous-devisings*, and *very-wickedness*. Of Antichrist it is said that he will think to change times and laws, and that they will be given into his hand for a certain period (*see* Daniel vii. 25). In Isaiah x. 5, and other passages he is mentioned as God's rod, *i.e.*, instrument of vengeance on Israel and other nations. This will account

Digitized by Google

for the Roll being allowed to go forth as a missive of judgment from the hand of God. Antichristian legislation is to be regarded as an infliction from His hand. What legislation can in its results be more fearful than the declaration that evil is good? This is marked as the character of the ordinances sanctioned on both sides of the Roll. Wickedness is sanctioned. One side of the Roll appears to refer to men's relation to God; the other to a man's relation to his neighbour. God allows this evil legislation to go forth as His curse, working utter ruin and destruction.

Verse 3. It seems extraordinary that the word נקה should have been translated by many "*cut off*," as if it implied an act of destructive judgment. It really is an expression that is used as declarative of innocence. See the following passages where this Hebrew word is translated by the words shewn in italics, all implying innocence:—

Genesis xxiv. 8, 41. If the woman will not follow thee, then *thou shalt be clear* from this my oath.

Exodus xxi. 19, . . . and he die not, but keepeth his bed; then shall he that smote him *be quit* [of the charge of manslaughter], only he shall pay for the loss of his time.

Numbers v. 19, 28, . . . then *be thou free* from this bitter water that causeth the curse.

Verse 31. Then shall the man *be guiltless*.

Judges xv. 3. Now *shall I be blameless* more than the Philistines.

1 Samuel xxvi. 9. Who can stretch forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, *and be guiltless?*

Psalm xix. 13. And I *shall be innocent* from the great transgression.

Digitized by Google

Proverbs xvi. 5, xvii. 5, xix. 5, 9, xxviii. 20. . . . shall not be *unpunished*. Margin, held innocent.

This Hebrew word occurs forty times as a verb, nearly a hundred times altogether; and there are only two verses in which any other meaning than *acquittal*, or *clearing from guilt*, is possible. In Isaiah iii. 26, describing the stroke which falls upon Jerusalem, it says, "And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she, being desolate, shall sit upon the ground." In the margin, however, it is stated that the Hebrew really is "she *being cleansed* shall sit," so that our translators took it to mean *cleaned-out*, that is, emptied. And in Amos iv. 6, "I have given you *cleanness* of teeth," that is, teeth innocent of biting any food.

The error of translating it in Zechariah v. 3, otherwise than, "*declared innocent*," has been recognized by our translators in the margin of our Bibles; also by the ancient Syriac Version. Dr Robert Young, of Edinburgh, in his Translation of the Bible (1863), renders it, "*hath been declared innocent*." The Latin versions of Castalio of Geneva, and of Burke, son-in-law of Bengel, in his Gnomon, and by Tremellius and Junius, agree in the meaning that the thief and the perjurer shall bear an unblemished reputation—shall go guiltless. J. H. Michaelis in his Hebrew Bible (1720) says that every thief, etc., according to it is stainless, *purus est*. There can be no doubt as to the correct rendering.

Verse 4. This is what the world will effect by its Antichristian legislation that will "*establish mischief by law*," thus cancelling the legislation of God.

Verse 5. The second half of this chapter must be regarded as preceding in time that which refers to the going forth of the curse. It is the general habit of

Scripture to treat first of the end before it details the circumstances that precede that end. The reign of the Ephah will result in the maintenance and diffusion of that wickedness which will consecrate iniquity, and bring down the curse of the flying Roll. The words "*going forth*" indicate in the case of the Ephah and in the case of the Roll, a like diffusiveness. They both go forth with sovereign influence; the land of Shinar and the land of Israel being the two great centres whence they proceed.

Verse 6. *Their aspect*:—The most ancient versions namely, the Septuagint, the Syriac, and the Arabic, read "*their iniquity*." The difference in writing the two Hebrew words is of exceeding minuteness, being merely a י for a ו, and indeed some Hebrew MSS. are said to read "*iniquity*." The uncertainty as to this would not affect the solemn instruction of the passage.

Verse 8. *Thrust down*:—This is the same word in Hebrew as that in the next clause rendered "*cast*." The woman rises up when the talent of lead is raised, as if she would emerge, but she is pushed back to remain hidden till the time for her manifestation shall have come (Rev. xvii.). This is important, as it evidently shows the nature of that restraining influence which is referred to in 2 Thessalonians ii. 6. The Apostle says, "You know that there is a restraining influence," but he does not say, "Ye know what that restraining influence is." καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ. The time is fast approaching when it will be removed. As soon as it is, the Woman shall be established in the land of Shinar, and Revelation xvii. will begin to be fulfilled. Revelation xvii. gives us her character, and Revelation xviii. her house.

Google

Verse 10. *Conducting* :—a word implying the leading or bringing of a person, or of a living agency identified with a person. Isaiah lxiii. 12, "He that *led them* by the right hand." The Ephah is not spoken of as *merely* an ephah; the predominating thought concerns the person who is hidden in it.

Verse 11. Literally, And it hath been prepared, and [then] she hath been caused to rest [or been brought to her resting-place] THERE. We have here to contrast the *rest* (נוח, *noaḥ*), which Noah (נח) and the Ark once brought to this renovated earth, with the character of the *rest* which man will stamp on the closing hour of its history. How different the force of the word נוח, *noaḥ*, as applied to Noah and his *rest* (Genesis v. 29), and the same word as used here of Babylon and her *rest!* I again repeat, Revelation xvii. describes the woman, and Revelation xviii. her house, where the civilization of unregenerate man will find the place of its last rest.

Plutocracy, founded on commercial wealth, is the pillar of this Satanic strength. Already, we can perceive the characteristic principles scattered, though not yet concentrated. The *time* of concentration we await; the *place* of concentration will be the Chaldæan city in the land of Shinar; and the first recorded Alleluia of heaven is caused by the overthrow of that city. See Revelation xix. 1-3.

Digitized by Google

DUTY OF GIVING HEED

TO THE

PREDICTIONS OF SCRIPTURE

RESPECTING EVENTS

THAT ARE TO

PRECEDE THE RETURN OF OUR LORD

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

Third Edition.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE - CLERKENWELL 6494.

1913.

Price 2d.

Digitized by Google

As a separate Tract—

First Edition	...	...	1861
Second ,,	...	...	1867

Reprinted in "Occasional Papers on Scriptural Subjects," No. 1, 1861.

Digitized by Google

DUTY OF GIVING HEED
TO THE
PREDICTIONS OF SCRIPTURE,
RESPECTING EVENTS THAT ARE TO PRECEDE THE RETURN OF OUR LORD.

THAT it is our duty to expect whatever the Scripture commands us to expect, is a truth too obvious to be questioned by any who reverence the Word of God. The *hope* of the Church is the return of her Lord. That hope He has set before us in those well-known words, "I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." Until *then*, we are appointed to remain militant in the earth, conflicting with many dangers, and many sorrows. If, in respect of the future, the Church had been instructed only with reference to its *hope;* if nothing respecting its own history or the world's history during the present period had been revealed; if the time of our sorrowful militancy had been left blank and undelineated, then, it would have been sinful presumption to affirm that any one event *must* occur in the interval between the departure and return of the Lord. But if the Scripture has *not* been

Digitized by Google

silent respecting the time of our militancy—if, on the contrary, it has prophesied very abundantly respecting the whole period of the Lord's absence, and more especially respecting the events that are immediately to precede His return, then, it becomes our duty to mark well what the Scripture has said, and to expect everything that it has commanded us to expect until the night of evil close. Otherwise, we despise the "light that shineth in a dark place;" we refuse to make it "a lamp to our feet."

When the doctrine of the Lord's premillennial return was, about thirty years ago*, revived in the Church, those who taught it were, for the most part, accustomed to say, that no event previous to His return was to be expected. This was taught, not because it was believed that the early Churches were forbidden to look for events that were to precede the coming of the Lord, but because *we* were supposed to be differently circumstanced. *They*, it was argued, had the whole course of the dispensation before them prophetically delineated in the Scripture, and consequently, by them, many events must necessarily have been expected; whereas we, it was said, were living at the very close of the dispensation, when every predicted event had been accomplished, and therefore, nothing any longer remained for which to wait.

But when the Scripture was searched more carefully, it was found that we had erred in supposing that all the

* This was written in 1861.

Digitized by Google

prophecies that pertained to the present dispensation had been accomplished. It was found that Zechariah xii. and xiv., and Matt. xxiv. 15, revealed events yet to be accomplished in the Land of Israel *before* Israel is forgiven—that the Head of the Roman Apostasy is not THE Antichrist who is to blaspheme God in Jerusalem, and to reign over all the kingdoms included within the whole Roman World—that the whole Roman World, Eastern and Western, has not yet been divided into the Ten Kingdoms that are to close its evil history—that the 1,260 *days* of Antichrist's blasphemy, instead of being accomplished, have not yet commenced—and that the predictions of the book of Revelation yet remain to be fulfilled. Thus we again found ourselves placed in circumstances closely resembling those of the early Churches, having a path before us prophetically marked by events intended as signs of the great approaching end.

Yet great reluctance has been exhibited by many in consenting to fall back into the place into which Truth constrains. Some, earnestly desiring the return of the Lord, are impatient of anything that implies delay. "Hope delayed maketh the heart sick." Others again, more weak in faith and timorous, and perhaps little acquainted with the Word of God, shrink from saying that there are to be events antecedent to the Lord's return, because they feel it to be a solemn thing to venture an assertion, which, to their conscience, appears

Digitized by Google

almost equivalent to saying with the evil servant, "My Lord delayeth His coming."

But although I would desire to respect the feelings that severally characterize each of these classes, we must, nevertheless, remember that everything inconsistent with Truth must be of the flesh and not of the Spirit. It was not the Spirit, but nature slow to receive what the Prophets had spoken, that brought the women with spices to the sepulchre. It was feeling unguided by Truth; for they knew not the Scriptures, and therefore understood not the thoughts and intentions of God. So in the present case: error and danger to the Church must result, if feelings or prepossessions be acted on that will not abide the test of the Word of God.

It has then been very extensively stated and extensively received, that it is spiritually injurious to the souls of God's people to believe that any event is to occur between the present moment and the Advent of the Lord: for that it is necessary to a right habit of soul to be in *momentary* expectation of His return.

If it were merely said that the one great object of the Church's hope and faith is the coming of the Lord, and that the Holy Spirit would seek to carry our thoughts over all intervening circumstances, so as not to rest in anything short of the return of the Lord—such a statement might unhesitatingly be received. But this is not the statement. What is meant is this—that it is contrary to the mind of the Lord that the Church should

Digitized by Google

have the knowledge of any event as certainly to occur previous to His return.

But surely the pattern of our instruction is the Scripture. There, if anywhere, we learn the manner in which God adapts His communications to the spiritual necessities of the heart of man, for "He knoweth what is in man." If there were something necessarily injurious to the soul in becoming acquainted with events which are appointed to occur previous to the Lord's return, we should not have found the early Churches instructed as they were: for they were instructed as to the occurrence of events which rendered the *daily* and instant expectation of the Lord's return, in their case, impossible. Peter, for example, had his own death foretold to him previously even to the commencement of his ministry, and yet no one would, on that account, affirm that Peter had not the proper expectancy of the Lord's return. If it had been the mind of the Spirit that he should have kept back the knowledge of this fact from the Church, he might, of course, have buried it in his own bosom. But Peter did not think it necessary to the right spiritual condition of the saints that they should be ignorant of the occurrence of this event. On the contrary, in a Catholic Epistle (an Epistle which he wrote not of himself, but as inspired by the Holy Ghost and in a passage in which he had been earnestly exhorting the Church to more vigorous service and watchfulness, he adds, "Yea, I think it right, as long as I am in this

Digitized by Google

tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly *I must put off this my tabernacle*, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me. Moreover, I will endeavour that ye may be able *after my decease* to have these things always in remembrance" (2 Pet. i. 13—15). Here the Churches are plainly taught by Peter, not only that he himself was to die, but also that they would continue after his decease, and would need the exhortation that he was then giving, as well as the light of Prophecy, that should continue to shine as "a light in a dark place until the day should dawn." Indeed, the whole Epistle speaks of the saints as about to continue, for some while, in the place of danger as well as darkness, for he goes on to warn them of the false teachers that should arise among them in the last days; and on this he grounds his exhortation to be "mindful" of the commandments of himself and the other Apostles, for that there should come in the last days, scoffers, etc. Surely the Holy Spirit would not have caused John to record (John xxi. 18), and Peter to refer to the Lord's prophetic intimation of Peter's death, if it had been necessary to the right spiritual condition of the saints that they should expect the return of the Lord without the expectation of any intervening event.

Again, in the case of Paul, in his second Epistle to Timothy, he tells him what would ultimately come to pass in the professing Church. "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their

Digitized by Google

own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears," etc. Yet even corruption affords fresh occasion for service, and vigour of action, to those who hold fast the faith. On the very ground then of this corruption being about to be, he rests his exhortation to Timothy to watch and make full proof of his ministry: for he adds, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." The reason of his thus speaking of his near departure, is to throw on Timothy increased responsibility in the future care of the Churches; yet at the same time telling him that, notwithstanding every effort, failure and departure from the Truth would certainly ensue. Here, therefore, again, as in the case of Peter before, we find not only the intimation of his own decease, but also a foretelling of those things that were to occur *after* that decease, and in which Timothy and others would live and act. So likewise in the address to the elders of Ephesus (Acts xx.) we find him saying, "Take heed to the flock, . . . for I know this, that *after my departing* shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things," etc. The evil thus predicted required at least *some* time for its development.

On the ground then of these and similar passages, I would again repeat, that to speak of events antecedent to the coming of the Lord, is not contrary to, but in accordance with the teaching of the Apostles. Thus

Digitized by Google

they taught the Churches, that so the people of God might know beforehand the character of the path in which they would be called to walk. Thus too, as I shall presently show, the Lord Jesus taught. Surely then it behoves us to be very jealous of the introduction of a principle which condemns the practice of the Apostles and of the Lord Himself. But not only so—not only does it impugn the mode of teaching which the Scripture uniformly adopts, but it also deprives the Church of that place of love and confidence in which it stands by the side of Him who said: "I have called you friends, for whatsoever I have heard of My Father I have made known unto you." For if it be wrong for the Church to have the knowledge of any events between the present moment and the Lord's return, it necessarily follows that the Lord could not have treated it in the confidence of love, but must have refused to teach it any thing connected with its own prospects and history in the earth. The Church could not have been entrusted with the knowledge of one event connected with its own history. Although it was the intention of the Lord that His Church should tarry on the earth for more than eighteen hundred years of sorrowful militancy, yet it must have been left in utter ignorance of all the circumstances of its way. It must have been kept in darkness as to everything that was to occur either in it or around it; because as soon as one event had been foretold, then there would have existed the knowledge of something

Digitized by Google

which must necessarily precede the Coming of the Lord. He could not even have said to the Church in Smyrna, "Ye shall have tribulation ten days;" much less could He have communicated all that the Apocalypse unfolds. He must have said, "I cannot treat you with confidence, for ye are unworthy. If I instruct you as to anything that is to come to pass, ye will use the knowledge amiss; your evil will find in it an occasion for saying that I delay My coming. Ye will not use the knowledge in grace, and therefore I will foretell you nothing." Such is the place in which, virtually, the Church is set by those who say that the knowledge of any intervening event is necessarily evil and contrary to the mind of Christ. But such is not the place assigned to us by the Lord. In the confidence of love He treats us as those to whom He could say, "I have called you friends." He desires to treat us as those in whose love He can confide. Thus when He spoke of His approaching departure He added, "Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 6, 7). Here, then, was an intervening event of unspeakable importance—the mission of the Comforter—that Comforter by whose authority and power the whole course of their testimony to Israel and to the Gentiles was to be ordered—a testimony that was to exceed the limits of

Digitized by Google

the Apostles' lives, as it is plain from the connected words, "they shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service;" a plain intimation that they would not live to witness their Lord's return. Indeed, all the concluding discourses of the Lord recorded in John, abound with allusions to events that were to intervene between His departure and return. The Church is not instructed on the supposition of being faithless, careless, and rejoiced at the departure of the Lord, but as those whose hearts sorrow had filled. The knowledge, therefore, of intervening events is not withheld from them. They are regarded as, through grace, loving Him who also has confidence in them; and thus whilst consolation and encouragement is ministered by seeing in the fact of the communication the abiding evidence of our Master's love, it also supplies the occasion for discipline of soul in patience, and therefore we read of "*the patience* of the kingdom of Jesus Christ."

Nor is this principle against which I am contending, at all in accordance with what experience teaches us in the ordinary conduct of human life. Men are daily accustomed in the ordering of their affairs to expect the occurrence of intervening circumstances without being thereby diverted from the great final object of their expectation. The return of beloved friends from a distant land, is waited for not less earnestly because a letter is first expected to intimate their approach. The result of

Digitized by Google

some long cherished plan, or favourite enterprise, is expected not less eagerly, because there may be some circumstances first to happen, necessary perhaps, as means to the end. The summer is not less certainly anticipated because the fig tree must first put forth its leaves. And if it be so in things that cannot be regarded as certain (for uncertainty must always mingle with the most assured of human prospects)—if even in such things the expectation of intervening circumstances is found to quicken, rather than deaden, liveliness of anticipation, how much more must it be so, when every event that happens is the sure and covenanted pledge of that which it is sent to indicate? Nor are we speaking of ordinary human expectancy, but of the earnestness of love (for the Church is addressed as loving Him); and that must be a strange character of love, which, because a token is expected from a returning friend, should so fix its thoughts on the token as to forget the friend.

If, then, it be true that the principle of which I have been speaking is contradicted by the teaching of the Lord Jesus and the Apostles, by the character of the Church's calling in love, and by what nature itself teaches, is it possible that it should be adopted without producing the most disastrous results?

Indeed such results have already abundantly appeared: for when it has been once assumed that no events antecedent to the Lord's return have been notified to the Church—in other words, that the Church has no instruc-

Digitized by Google

tion respecting its own history in the earth, then it necessarily follows that some method must be found for destroying the application to ourselves of those parts of the Scripture which, until lately, have been uniformly regarded by the whole Church of God as their especial portion, and as revealing facts peculiarly connected with themselves.

For, when I read in Matthew xxiv., such words as these: "Now learn a parable of the fig tree: when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors" —and, again in Luke xxi., "Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away: but My words shall not pass away. And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares as a snare. For it shall come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be strengthened* to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the

* I translate according to the corrected reading of this passage.

Digitized by Google

Son of man"—when I read these solemn words, it must be obvious to every one, that the persons addressed are commanded to wait and earnestly to watch for the *signs* of their Lord's return, and upon their obedience to this command their preparedness for receiving Him depends. It becomes, therefore, a question of no little moment, whether these words were intended *for us*, as being, like the Apostles, believers in Him who spake them: or whether they are designed, not for us, but for others. This is the important question—important, not because of any difficulty in returning the reply, but because these passages and other like passages, have, of late, been rejected as having no proper bearing on ourselves, on the ground of the Apostles being Jews, and therefore (as it is said) not representatives of the Church: and thus these passages, and therefore all the Gospels (for they cannot be separated), must cease to be regarded as addressed to Christians: for if the Apostles be not properly our representatives in Luke xxi. and Matthew xxiv., there is less reason why they should be so in the doctrinal and practical instructions which they received; for doctrines and precepts which have a present reference to those to whom they are spoken, are more likely to be limited in their application, than those which, being prophetic, are necessarily future—perhaps remote in their fulfilment, and possibly designed not so much for those personally addressed as for others represented by them. The same principle that takes away from us Luke xxi.

Digitized by Google

and Matthew xxiv., will certainly deprive us of the Sermon on the Mount and the promises and instructions in John xiv. ("they shall put you out of *the synagogues*", etc.), for in these passages the persons who were addressed were Jews, and Jewish allusions abound: and the principle is, that where there is any thing characteristically Jewish in place or circumstance, there there is that which is not properly Christian—a principle so utterly false, that nothing but a determination to affirm that no events antecedent to the Lord's return are made known to the Church, could account for its adoption by any reflective mind. If it be once admitted that the Apostles did not receive the instructions of the Lord *as Christians and for Christians*, the foundations of Christian truth are gone. When the foundations of the walls of that heavenly City which is the Bride of the Lamb, were beheld by John in vision, on those foundations were seen the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. If we are to be excluded from the truths which the twelve Apostles taught, surely we must be excluded from the Heavenly City.

There is, therefore, no little reason to be alarmed at the introduction, and now, wide dissemination of a principle, which, if established, would prevent our souls from being brought under the power of those very parts of the Word of God which are specially and peculiarly our own. *Many* parts of the Old Testament belong to dispensations that have passed away: others to dispen-

Digitized by Google

sations yet to come. Such passages, though they may supply certain principles capable of being *applied* to believers now, yet cannot be primarily interpreted of them; for we are not under the law as Israel was, nor in millennial rest as, in the next dispensation, Israel will be. So, likewise, in the Gospels, many instructions were addressed to the disciples in their then present circumstances—circumstances that ceased to exist after the death and resurrection of their Lord; and all such instructions were, of necessity, limited to the time then present. Thus it is not now said to us, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any villages of the Samaritans enter ye not;" nor are we commanded to observe the bidding of those "who sit in Moses' seat," for with the death of Jesus the claims of the Mosaic economy terminated. But it is otherwise with those passages which were intended to guide their service *during the time of His personal absence from them.* With respect to such passages, we have a right to expect a clear, unhesitating answer from all who teach in the Church: for it has been well said that "ambiguities are to be avoided in the Church of God."

For whom then were the prophetic or prospective instructions of the Lord as recorded in the Gospels intended? They were exclusively intended for those who, as united with Him risen, and recipients of the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, were appointed to bear witness to Him, and to suffer for Him during the time of His per-

Digitized by Google

sonal absence, and during the time of Israel's national unbelief. Wherever we find these characteristics, there we find those who belong to the Church of the First-born. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God," etc. All who received Him became in the same sense sons of God. It was equally true of John and of Cornelius—of Peter the Apostle of the circumcision, and of Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles. Whether, therefore, we read as in John, "They shall put you out of the synagogues, yea, the time cometh when whosoever killeth you shall think that he doeth God service;" or as in Matthew, "Ye shall be hated of all nations for My name's sake:" those words, although addressed to those who were Jews by nature, yet did not pertain to them as Jews, but as those who, through faith in Jesus, had been brought into that one body in which there is "neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all." They had all alike become "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ."

If we say that the prospective instructions addressed to the disciples in the twenty-fourth of Matthew, and the thirteenth of Mark, and the twenty-first of Luke, were not addressed to them as *Christians*—that is, as persons who were brought into all the fulness of the redemption prepared by God in Christ, then it is obvious that all the instructions respecting the observance of the Supper of

Digitized by Google

the Lord, and Baptism, and all the prospective instructions of the Sermon on the Mount, could not have been addressed to them as Christians. Nor could the prayer which their departing Lord prayed over them in the seventeenth of John, have been prayed over them as *Christians;* for the company gathered around Him on Olivet in Matthew xxiv.—and those to whom He gave the bread and the wine at the last supper—and those over whom He prayed in John—and those to whom He said in Galilee, "Go ye therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them,"—were all one and the same company, instructed by Him and prayed for by Him with respect to circumstances that should surround them *after* His departure, and *after* they should have received the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.

If sad experience did not teach us that there is no aberration too great for the waywardness of the human mind, we might deem it impossible that any who receive the Scripture should assert that the Apostles at Pentecost, and those who on that day were with them baptized by the power of the Holy Ghost, had not attained the position proper to the Church of God. How marvellously strange that any should labour to exalt the Apostle Paul and his Gentile converts into a pre-eminence denied to Peter, and John, and those whom their ministry gathered into that Pentecostal body on which so great grace rested! How strange that they accord to Paul and his converts, but deny to the twelve and their Pentecostal converts the

Digitized by Google

name and standing of the Church of God! Paul did not this, when he emphatically spoke of the greatness of his sin consisting in this, that he had persecuted "*the Church of God*" (1 Cor. xv. 9). Would he have called the saints who preceded him the Church of God, if they had not been the Church of God? So far from Paul dissociating himself from the Apostles who preceded him, and seeking to exalt himself into a distinct and higher sphere of ministry, he does the very reverse. He labours in the fifteenth of 1st Corinthians to show that although born late and as a weakling into the family of faith, yet that he was by grace strengthened to bear the *same* testimony as they, and to labour in the diffusion thereof even more abundantly. "So then whether it were I or they, so WE preach, and so ye believed." Can any words imply consociation of labour more strongly than these? And in the second of the Ephesians, does he there seek to separate off his Gentile converts into a separateness and distinctness of privilege apart from those who had previously been gathered in from Israel? On the contrary, his effort is to show that the Gentiles who believed, though gathered in later, were yet, through God's marvellous grace, allowed to enter into co-equal fellowship with all the Jewish believers who had preceded, so as in Christ to form one body. The thought of the exclusion of Jewish believers from that body, whether those believers had believed previous to the Advent of Christ, or during the ministration of Christ, or at Pentecost, is a

Digitized by Google

thought so extravagant, so utterly at variance with all that God has revealed as to the methods of His grace, that it is not even mentioned, much less discussed, in the Scripture. Nor was the thought of his being separated unto a special and peculiar Gospel in the mind of the Apostle, when he wrote of that "great salvation which began to be spoken BY THE LORD, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him" (Heb. ii. 3). Is it possible to devise any form of words that could more unambiguously declare that the Gospel preached by the Lord, and by the twelve, and by Paul, was emphatically *the same?*

Nor does this novel doctrine which asserts that the Pentecostal Christians were not properly gathered into the Church and the Church's blessings, at all answer the end which they who advocate it propose. They hope by this doctrine to sustain their theory respecting the Lord's prophetic instructions in Matthew and the other Gospels not being addressed to, or intended for, the Church. But suppose we were to admit the supposition that the Pentecostal Christians were not properly Christian, and that the calling of "the Church" commenced with Paul, yet, even then, how can we exclude Paul and his Gentile converts from Matthew xxiv. and Luke xxi.? When I read, "Ye shall be hated of all nations for My name's sake; they shall lay hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and into prisons," etc., will any affirm that Paul and his Gentile converts

Digitized by Google

are not as much contemplated in these passages as any whom the Pentecostal Apostles converted from Israel? Surely we cannot exclude Gentile believers from such passages. They too were hated—they were imprisoned —they were brought before kings and rulers for Christ's name sake. Unless then we are to exclude Gentile believers as well as Jewish from the Church of God, and so have no Church of God at all, we must admit that the Church is addressed in Matthew xxiv. and Luke xxi.; and if the Church is addressed, then the Church is instructed as to certain things that were to happen to it previous to the return of the Lord, and is commanded to watch for the appointed signs, and thus the whole theory and all its consequents fall to the ground.

The prophecy of the Lord Jesus in Matthew xxiv. was delivered after His ministry towards Israel had closed. In the immediately preceding chapter we find Him presenting Himself to Jerusalem and to the rulers of Israel for the last time. They continued to reject Him, and He left them. He quitted the city and went without the gate, and retired to the Mount of Olives, saying as He left the city, "Verily I say unto you, YE shall not see Me henceforth till YE shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Such were His last words to Israel. The "YE" of this verse belongs to *them*. They were left *within* the gates of Jerusalem, rejecters of the Lord, and rejected by Him. The "YE" of the twenty-third chapter is Jewish.

Digitized by Google

But now compare with the "YE" of the twenty-*third* chapter the "YE" of the twenty-*fourth*. The "YE" of the twenty-fourth pertains to those who had not rejected, but who had believed on the Lord Jesus. They remained not within the gates of Jerusalem attached either to the halls of Caiaphas or of Pilate. They went without the gate, bearing His reproach. God from heaven looked down upon them and viewed them in everlasting association with all the grace and all the power of redemption that was in Christ. The prayer which their Lord, a short time afterward, prayed over them, in the seventeenth of John, was but the expression of the thoughts that He had had respecting them, from the moment they first confessed His saving name. Who then more blessed than the disciples who stood around their rejected Lord on Olivet? They stood there, not as associated with rebellious and rejected Jerusalem, but as associated with the Son of the living God—sharing His sorrows, but heirs also of His glory. *As such* they are instructed in the twenty-fourth of Matthew. The Lord prophetically sketches the path which they, and others like them, would have to tread during the time of His absence, and their own sorrowful militancy. The "YE" of this chapter denotes not merely the four Apostles to whom it was primarily applied. It was a corporate "YE," applied to them as the representatives of others. It denoted all who were then the acknowledged disciples of Jesus, and all who should become the acknowledged disciples of

Digitized by Google

Jesus up to the moment when His glory shall be made manifest. Up to the time of the conversion of Cornelius, the "YE" of this chapter was restricted to believing Jews, but after his admission into the Church, it was extended to believing Gentiles also. And as time rolled on, and darkness settled in on Israel, and as those thence gathered into the fold of faith became fewer and fewer, this "YE" of discipleship became, by force of circumstances, almost restricted to believers from among the Gentiles. It is the lot of Gentile believers, more especially, to see iniquity abounding, and love waxing cold, during the time that the Gospel is being preached for a witness to all nations. Nevertheless, when the hour of final crisis approaches, and the time of unequalled tribulation on Jerusalem draws near, the "YE" of this chapter will again include many a believing Jew. Gentile believers and Jewish believers—all made one body in Christ—all brought into the Church of the living God—are therefore included in this "YE." It pertains to them, and to them alone.

What then are they directed to expect? Are they taught to expect no intervening event between the departure and return of their Lord? Is not the very object of the prophecy to mark a succession, and a long succession, of intervening events? Were they not cautioned against believing that the wars and commotions which were to follow His departure were signs of the end? "All these things must come to pass, BUT THE END IS

Digitized by Google

NOT YET." Did not the Lord then accurately delineate that path which His Church has, for the last eighteen hundred years, been treading, and which is even now not ended? Still iniquity abounds, still love waxes cold, still the Gospel is being preached as a witness. Nor shall we, until we shall see the idolatry of Antichrist established in Jerusalem, and the unequalled, though shortened season of tribulation, come and approach its close, be able to say these are the things respecting which our Master has said, "When ye shall see these things come to pass, know ye that it is nigh, even at the doors." As the budding of the fig-tree indicates the near approach of spring, so surely shall these things indicate His glorious coming; and for these things He commands us to wait and to watch. Would the Lord have commanded us to watch for these events if such watching produced a bad spiritual effect on the soul, and tended to make it say, "My Lord delayeth His coming," therefore I will eat and drink with the drunken? Will any indeed say that the teaching of intervening events produces this effect, when they must acknowledge that in this chapter the Lord Jesus has not only spoken of intervening events, but commanded us to expect them, and made such expectation essential to a right condition of watchfulness?

To say, then, that the prophetic and prospective instructions addressed to the twelve Apostles were not addressed to them as our representatives, is virtually to reject the Scripture as our guide. We are as much

Digitized by Google

bound to expect every event that Matt. xxiv., Mark xiii., and Luke xxi. predict, as we are to observe the commandment of the Lord respecting Baptism and the Supper. The promises too—"Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the age," and, "I will come again and receive you unto Myself," are addressed to the very same persons as those who are commanded to watch for the signs predicted in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. If the reasons were valid for rejecting the latter, they would equally prove that we were not concerned with the former.

And what words can be more plain than the words I have just quoted—"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age" (αιωνος). How could the Lord promise to be with His suffering disciples "*until* the end of the age," if they were to be taken away from the earth *before* "the end of the age"? Nor is "the end of the age" an uncertain or ambiguous expression. In the parable of "the wheat and tares" in Matthew, it is expressly defined to be "the harvest"—"the harvest is the end of the age;" and the harvest is marked as being the period when the holy angels shall be sent forth finally to separate those who have *truly*, and those who have *nominally*, professed the name of Jesus: the former being gathered to the heavenly garner, the latter "cast into the furnace of fire." "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are

Digitized by Google

the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the age (*αιωνος*) and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this age. The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." In explaining the parable of the net, the Lord again uses the same expression. "So shall it be at the end of the age: THE ANGELS shall come forth and shall separate the wicked from among the righteous"—*αφοριουσιν τους πονηρους εκ μεσου των δικαιων.* Whenever, by this mission of the holy angels, the final separation between false and true professors of the name of Jesus takes place, the Day of the Lord will have come. Until then the wheat and the tares "*grow together.*"

The wheat and tare field represents *Christendom* (Christ's kingdom) that is, those who have been baptized into the profession of the name of Christ. At the time of the Lord's return, there will be multitudes in the earth who will not form a part of Christendom, and therefore will not fall within the scope of this parable. For example, the whole Roman World (*ἡ οικουμενη*) which will then have become divided into ten kingdoms, will

Digitized by Google

have apostatized into infidelity and avowedly rejected the name of Christ, and worshipped Antichrist. No part of it, therefore, will at that time belong to Christendom. It will have a history of its own. The Jews, too, and Mohammedans, and the Heathen, are to be excluded from this parable; for they form no part of Christendom. They are neither tares nor wheat.

Long before the Apostles died, the fair field of wheat which at Pentecost seemed to promise so much, became marred by the interminglement of tares; and since then, tares and wheat have grown on in the world together. Are we then told anything respecting the period when this growing together is to cease? Is the wheat to be removed *before* the tares? Is it to be reaped secretly and gathered secretly into the heavenly garner? and are the tares to remain and flourish in the earth *after* the wheat has been thus removed? No: they are "to grow TOGETHER *until the harvest.*" And what is the harvest? The "end of the age"—the end of man's day of evil. And by what is it marked? By sending forth the holy angels to gather *first* the tares, *then* the wheat. And what does "gathering" as used in this parable, imply? It implies in the case both of the wheat and of the tares, removal from the earth—in other words, the cessation of natural existence here. The saints, as represented by the wheat, are to be removed from the earthly into the heavenly branch of the Kingdom of God, whilst the tares will be taken altogether out of the Kingdom to

Digitized by Google

which they only nominally belong, and will be cast into the furnace of fire. This is the harvest, or end of the age: for observe, the harvest is not said to be *in* the end of the age, but "the harvest *is* the end of the age." Until *then*, the wheat and the tares grow *together*. If then the wheat and the tares grow together till the end of the age, the wheat cannot be removed before the end of the age. Nothing can be more demonstratively conclusive than this parable; yet not more conclusive than the words, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the age."

Some who have wished to avoid the force of this parable, have suggested that the gathering of the tares may possibly mean a slow, progressive gathering (such as has long ago commenced) of false professors around various centres of evil such as Popery, neology, and the like; and that the angels may represent, not holy angels, but evil *principles*, or perhaps evil spirits by whom men are attracted to the aforesaid centres of falsehood. But to say that "angels" do not mean "angels," but principles, would be in itself neology. Nor is it possible that "*His* angels," that is, Christ's angels ("the Son of man shall send forth His angels") can mean anything else than holy angels: nor would it be possible for *evil* angels to gather Christ's saints into the heavenly garner, and the saints are to be gathered by the same agency—the same "*reapers*" that gather the tares. Moreover, the gathering as we have seen, involves removal from the

Digitized by Google

earth, and therefore implies that the period of their earthly existence is brought to a close for ever. The gathering of the tares is *immediately* followed by their being cast into the furnace of fire. Other arguments might be added; but I should despair of convincing any who are not convinced by what has been already said.

Others have suggested that the parable of the wheat and tares has no reference to the present period: that the wheat represents not the saints of the present, but the saints of the next dispensation. But the next dispensation is the millennial. The period of the Church's *sorrowful* militancy ends as soon as this present dispensation ends. How could the parable of the wheat and tares apply to the next dispensation? The very point in which the coming dispensation is contrasted with the present is, that Satan will be bound, and therefore will no longer be able to sow tares among the wheat. Of converted Israel (and to them the testimonies of Truth in the next dispensation are to be committed) it is said, "they shall be all righteous." The wheat field will be spoiled by no intermingled tares, nor will the banner of Truth when committed to their hands, be again dragged dishonoured in the dust as it has been by the professing Church of the present dispensation.

Nor would the history of Christianity in the *next* dispensation be a subject that would properly fall within the scope of the Gospel of Matthew. The specific subject of the prophetic parables of Matthew is the history

Digitized by Google

of the period during which Jerusalem and Israel are left in unbelief and desolation, and a body of professed believers, including some Jews and many Gentiles, becomes the witness for Christ during His personal absence. The rejection therefore of the Son of Abraham and of David by Israel corporately, and His nominal, (and in some cases) true, reception by others, principally gathered from among the Gentiles, is the especial subject of Matthew throughout: so that Matthew may, in a peculiar sense, be considered the Gentile Gospel, inasmuch as it treats of Christianity throughout the period during which, scorned by the house of Israel, it sojourns in Gentile and Galilean places. All the prophetic parables of Matthew have this character strongly marked on them, as may be easily seen by an examination of those recorded in the thirteenth chapter.*

I must repeat then, that the one declaration that the wheat and the tares are to grow *together* until the holy angels at the end of the age are sent forth to separate them, is of itself sufficient to prove that the saints of the present dispensation are not to be removed from the earth until the day of man terminates for ever. What presumption could be greater than to affirm that the wheat are taken away from the earth before the tares, when this parable so distinctly declares that they are "to grow *together* until the harvest?" Again, the

* See tract entitled, "Thoughts on the History of Professing Christianity as given in the Parables of Matthew xiii.," as advertised on cover.

Digitized by Google

prophecy of Matthew xxiv. (unless indeed we reject it) throws on us the responsibility of watching for the predicted signs. If we refuse to observe those signs, we virtually refuse to watch in the only way in which we can watch rightly according to God's Word. And although such watching will not enable us to know the day or the hour of the revelation of the Lord, yet it will enable us to know when it is nigh, even at the doors. "Now learn a parable of the fig tree: when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves ye know that summer is nigh. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things (the predicted signs) come to pass, know that it is near, even at the doors."

C. M. Tucker, Printer, 15 Finsbury Circus, E.C.
Google

THE ALTERED TRANSLATION

OF

Genesis ii. 5,

AS GIVEN IN

THE REVISED ENGLISH VERSION,

CONSIDERED.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4468.

1888

Digitized by Google

LONDON :
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO.
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL

Digitized by Google

Translation of Genesis ii. 5.

§ I.

It seems needful that attention should be directed to the translation of Genesis ii. 5, as given by the Revisers in their new English version. It is a translation which is not without its advocates, both in ancient and in modern days. But it is a translation greatly to be deplored; or perhaps I ought rather to say—denounced. It is pregnant with evil; because it sets the statements of the first of Genesis in direct opposition to those of the second chapter. Such contrarieties Neology delights in, because it knows that Scripture becomes by such means a doubted and suspected book. There is, however, no real authority for the altered translation. It is one that is unquestionably erroneous.

I cannot proceed without first saying how often I look back wistfully to the habits of the days of our childhood. Christians were accustomed then to read the Scripture simply. It was accepted in its obvious natural meaning. The statements of the Bible were looked upon as axioms, sure and certain as those of Euclid. By those axioms we

Digitized by Google

deemed ourselves supplied with sure premises on which our conclusions could be fixedly and unchangeably founded. So, pious parents and instructors taught those committed to their care. But all this is changed now. Other habits prevail. Even the pious suffer themselves to doubt and hesitate, when they should be as bold as lions. A chaos of thought and feeling has been permitted to surround us, betokening the near approach of that hour when God will send on men "strong delusion that they should believe a lie." The night of nights is coming, and in it, none must expect to be delivered except those who resolutely cleave to God's Word WRITTEN. There we find an anchorage. May God grant that we may hold fast the lessons of our childhood, learned whilst we were as yet ignorant of the perverse disputings that have since prevailed.

And now let us consider this new translation. The fourth and fifth verses of Genesis ii. stand thus in the Revised Version.

4. "*These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven.*

5. "*And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprung up, for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth and there was not a man to till the ground.*"

The first question we have to ask is, "To what does the expression 'yet,' or rather 'not yet,' refer?"

Some perhaps will say, "It refers to the period mentioned in the preceding verse when Creation was finished." No more plausible answer could be given, for the two verses are closely connected, and it is admitted by well nigh all, that the previous verse and verses do refer to the *completion* of the six days' Creation. Yet such an answer will not bear one moment's examination; for it implies that the grass, plants, and trees were *non-existent* when Creation was *finished*, whereas the third day is distinctly said to be the period in which they were brought into being.

Others, perhaps, may say that the words "*not yet*," refer back to the period when God commenced the work of creation, and gradually carried it on to its accomplishment. If the verse were so understood all the instruction conveyed by it would be this, that no grass, plants, or trees, existed till they did exist. Scripture does not enunciate such empty truisms as this. Moreover, in a new and independent sentence (such as the Revisers have made the fifth verse to be), the past tense in Hebrew would have been used, and not the progressive future;* and thirdly, neither this nor the preceding interpretation would bear the test of the word FOR, which commences the clause that follows. That one little word FOR, does of itself nullify the translation thoroughly.

* I will explain by and by what I mean by the *progressive* future.

Digitized by Google

The words are: "No plant of the field was yet in the earth . . . FOR" there was no rain nor any human cultivator. Now it is true that *the growth and development* of plants in the earth may require rain and cultivation, and this is that which the verse, *rightly translated*, intimates. But the Revisers' translation makes the original *existence* of plants (an existence resulting wholly from that creative power of God who "spake and it was done") to depend on rain and cultivation by the hand of man. Rain and cultivation are by such a translation made prerequisites to the original *existence* of plants, and so are virtually made creative agencies,—a doctrine welcomed no doubt by neologian and evolutionary theology; but such doctrine leads not to Heaven. The translation of the Revisers contradicts all that the first chapter of Genesis (according to their own translation thereof) had taught, and nullifies its most prominent declarations.

I suppose that none who retain a semblance of reverence for Holy Scripture, would ask me to believe that Adam and Eve were created *as infants*, or that the beasts first existed *in embryo*, or that the fowls described as made to "fly in the open firmament of heaven" existed first in egg shells. If then man and the rest of the animal creation were brought into existence in maturity, why should it be otherwise with the plants? Of all parts of creation none were more needed than the grass, plants, and trees, for they were appointed to be the food both of man

Digitized by Google

and beast. They were needed, therefore, in their *maturity*. But if (as this false translation teaches) they were not existent, if they were not at all "in the earth," until rain and a human cultivator were provided, then they could not have been created (as the Scripture states them to have been created) on the third day. They could not have existed when Adam, the cultivator, was created on the sixth; and, therefore, Adam and all the animals of earth, must have found themselves foodless. There could not have been even seedlings, for the proposed translation says, that until there was a cultivator, plants had no existence in the earth. Few, I suppose, will believe that Adam and the animals were created foodless. Nevertheless, this translation will not be harmless. It will encourage men to say that the first and second of Genesis contradict each other. Scripture (if not deemed untrustworthy) will be regarded as a book too hard to be understood, too full of contradictions for its statements to be harmonized, and so it will become practically abandoned; consequently other guidance will be sought for. Even Christians through timidity and inertness, quickly fall into the snare of the great Destroyer. Light vouchsafed may easily be quenched.

I will not say that there is no apparent difficulty in the verse, but it will be instantly removed by more strict translation. There would be great improvement in all our translations throughout the whole Bible by more attention to the uses of the

Digitized by Google

tenses, especially the *future*, and by a more correct rendering of חָיָה, *to become* (γινγομαι).

The Greek word ειμι, *to be*, has been almost universally taken to represent the force of the word חָיָה in Hebrew, whereas חיה, whilst denoting *existence* or *being*, denotes also a power of development connected with such being. Consequently, γινγομαι *to become*, represents its meaning far more closely than ειμι, *to be*. Ειμι, *to be*, is used *in Greek* to express the logical *copula* connecting the subject and predicate of a proposition; and it has been supposed that חיה in Hebrew performs the same office; but this is an entire mistake and a dangerous one, destroying or perverting the meaning of numberless passages throughout the Scripture. When development, progression, or (as in some cases) change of condition, is to be indicated, חיה (γινγομαι) is used. It denotes existence, but not existence *merely*. There is a super-added thought. It denotes also development or power of development.

I can say of a tree when first created in maturity, חיה, εγενετο — marking thereby its attainment of existence; but if I speak of the results of that attained existence in subsequent developments, I use in Hebrew another tense, *the future*.

To this subject I hope to return. At present I will only say that in Hebrew, one of the chief uses of the future tense is to denote *progression*, as in Leviticus i., "God *went on to speak* unto Moses." Examples of this use of the future abound; for

Digitized by Google

progressive development (whether present or past to those who contemplate it) *must be future in respect of that point whence the development proceeds.* "The seeds proceed to germinate." This would be expressed by the *future* tense in Hebrew, but our language uses the present. Accordingly, the verse we are considering does not direct our minds to that attained condition of created perfectness into which (as the preceding verses declare) all things had been brought, but it speaks of *the results* of that attained condition in respect of progression to future developments. God made perfectly every plant of the field before it *went on* to develop that existence, and the conditions and results thereof in the earth. This progression of development is denoted *by the use of the future tense of* חיה *in the passage before us:* the Revisers' translation would have required the past. The statement, therefore, of this passage rightly translated is as follows:

"*These are the generations of the Heavens and of the Earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made Earth and Heavens, and every plant of the earth before it went on to develop itself in the earth, and every herb of the field before it went on to grow; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and* [*there was*]* *no man to till the ground.*" Rain and cultivation (as I have

* I insert these words in brackets, for the logical copula, as is usual in Hebrew, is not expressed.

There are many instances of מרם being used in the sens

before said) may be needed for the further development of that which had been created: but rain and cultivation were not needed or employed in creation. Thus translated these verses do not contradict, but corroborate all that had been, in the previous chapter, revealed; and the normal meaning of היה is not set aside, and the proper use of the Hebrew future is maintained, and *some* of the empty notions about ו *conversive*, are exploded. Moreover, if these facts in the physical creation are regarded as pre-figuring greater mercies vouchsafed in the spiritual creation, we easily recognise the fact that although the new man is created in believers in all fixed and abiding moral perfectness, yet blessing from Heaven above, and cultivation in the earth beneath, are needed for its growth, development, and fruitfulness. Existence is one thing: progression quite another.

---

of "before" (*πρων*), as the Septuagint rightly renders it. In Numbers xi. 33, we read, "And while the flesh was yet between their teeth, ERE [that is, before] it was chewed." See also Gen. xxvii. 4; Ex. i. 19; Jer. i. 5; and Hag. ii. 15.

Its original meaning, "*not yet*," *ουπω*, is found in 1 Sam. iii. 7: and this meaning can easily be traced in the passages where it is rightly rendered, *ere*, or *before*. Thus we might render Gen. ii. 5, "And every plant of the field (as yet it had not proceeded to develop itself) and every herb of the field (as yet it had not proceeded to grow)," &c. So also in Numbers—"While the flesh (it was not yet chewed) was still in their teeth." To avoid such awkward parenthetic amplification the word "*before*" is used to condense the form of expression.

Digitized by Google

As regards this verse I trust enough has been said to elucidate its meaning in the judgment of every candid and thoughtful mind. I will now pass on to notice a few other points in connection with these two chapters.

Some have hinted at, others have maintained, the probability of the existence of pre-Adamic men. The words "First man Adam" (1 Cor. xv. 45), and "First man" (1 Cor. xv. 47) are sufficient to silence that thought for ever. Shall we avowedly and deliberately contradict God, and accuse Him of error or of falsehood? "Let God be true, and every man a liar."

Some have spoken of a pre-Adamic earth. Surely if there had been a pre-Adamic earth we should have found in Scripture some reference to it and to its history. We read in the Scripture of the pre-Adamic existence of angels in Heaven, and of the fall of those among them who sinned. Is it possible that this earth should ever have been inhabited by such angels, and the Scripture be utterly silent respecting it? Are we to invent histories of which the Word of God says nothing, and propose our speculations as axioms on which to base conclusions that materially affect our faith and our interpretation of Scripture?

But we go further than this. Not only is the Scripture silent, but its declarations, direct and indirect, preclude the possibility of such a world having existed.

Digitized by Google

Take, for example, the 16th verse of Psalm cxv.: "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; *but the earth hath He given to the children of men.*" These words sufficiently show that the Scriptures recognise no "earth" that is not the heritage of Man. This could not have been said if there had been a *pre-Adamic* "earth" given to fallen angels; nor could it have been said, "By one man," and "by one offence," sin and judgment entered into the world" (Rom. v.), for in the case supposed, Sin would have entered earth before Adam existed.

The indirect evidence of Scripture on this subject is strong. Thus when Moses in Deuteronomy speaks to Israel of antecedent times, to what period does he trace back those times? Whence does he date their commencement? Does he go back beyond the creation of man? No; he speaks of the creation of man as the primary point from which the dealings of God with this earth are to be dated. "Ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, *since the day that God created man upon the earth*," &c. (Deut. iv. 32.) The commencement of the earth's existence is clearly marked as being the limit set to human thought in tracing the earth's past history. What would be the consequence of passing that limit? Bewilderment.

But again in Isaiah lxv. 17 we find the words, "Behold, I create new Heavens and a new Earth, and the former shall not be remembered, or come into mind." These words authorise my saying that

Digitized by Google

"the *former*" heavens and earth here spoken of are the Adamic heavens and earth that we now behold; for after they have ceased to be, the *possibility* of their being remembered and coming into mind is recognised; though practically such remembrance will not be, for, familiar though we have been with the first heavens and earth, we shall not seek, or desire, to go back to the remembrance of their imperfectnesses and sorrows.* *Pre-Adamic* Heavens and Earth could not be thus spoken of as subjects of possible remembrance, for things that we have never heard of, and of which we know nothing, *could not* come back into our remembrance.

Moreover, the word here translated "former," (ראשׁוֹן) means strictly *first*, as may be seen in its use in various passages, especially Isaiah xliv. 6, "I am the first, and I am the last, and besides me there is no God." See also Isaiah xlviii. 12. I am, therefore, justified in saying that as Scripture recognises only two creations of Earth (the first in connection with "the *first* Adam," and the next in connection with "the *last* Adam"), the words of Isaiah describe this Adamic creation as the first heavens and earth, and the new and yet future creation as the second and final creation which shall abide for ever, because founded not on the weakness of an earthly Head, but on the abiding strength of Him who is "the

* The millennial earth is Adamic, and even its history at its close will be marked by a rebellion and judgment more awful than any that yet have been.

Digitized by Google

second Man, the Lord from heaven." The first creation of earth and the last creation of earth are indissolubly bound up with the history of two Heads, the first Adam and the last Adam. And this is an additional reason for insisting on the use of the word *first* instead of *former* in the passage before us.

But we can go even yet further. We can say that we have the direct authority of God Himself for thus interpreting this passage, for in the Revelation we read, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the FIRST heaven and the FIRST earth (ὁ πρωτος ουρανος και ἡ πρωτη γη), had passed away, and there was no more sea." No one can deny that these words refer to the same event that is spoken of in Isaiah. Consequently, we have Divine authority for saying that "the former heavens and earth," are the FIRST heavens and earth. God who tells us that Adam was the FIRST man, tells us also that the heavens and earth that are to be succeeded by the new heavens and earth, are the FIRST heavens and earth.

We are bound, therefore, to reject and to repel all teaching that would set aside these plain declarations. There is no disobedience more to be dreaded than disobedience of mind to the plain declarations of God.

There are a few other points on which I will touch in the next section.

Digitized by Google

§ II.

ENOUGH has, I trust, been said to show that there can have been no *pre-Adamic man*, nor any *pre-Adamic earth*. That which God has denominated FIRST must be first. He has said, "*First* Earth," and "*First* Man." As respects Genesis ii. 5, so far from contradicting the statements of Genesis i., it strongly corroborates them. The plants and trees were *created in maturity*, and *so* were planted in the Earth. They went through no process of growth, development, or cultivation. Their development and growth (and it is of this that the fifth verse of Genesis ii., when rightly translated, treats) was subsequent to their introduction into the earth, and the accessory means necessary to such development were subsequently provided. Rain and cultivation were in due season supplied. Let us hold these things fast as fixed axioms, and we shall find that the statements of Genesis accord not only with each other, but with the Truth.

There are, however, a few other points, chiefly verbal and grammatical, which it may be well to notice. One of our chief duties is to receive reverently, and with simplicity, the *words* of God. They are "pure words, like silver refined in a furnace—words of earth purified seven times."*

* So I would translate this passage, about which there has been much discussion. The translation, "furnace of earth,"

Digitized by Google

(Ps. xii. 6.) God may, and does, condescend to use "words of earth," but He takes care that they should be as "silver purified in a furnace," that no dross might be in them. But although taken from the languages of earth, and controlled by the rules by which men regulate those languages, they are not, as used by God, the offspring of human thought, but words taught to His Prophets and Apostles by the Holy Ghost, accurate in their meaning, and free from all error, either in the way of excess, or of deficiency. Even when they refer to earthly things, with which men are familiar in science or in history, they are still words "taught by the Holy Ghost," having no error—no dross in them. Against God's words so regarded, men fiercely struggle. They seem to arrogate to themselves the exclusive lordship of earth, and say, "Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?" "Their tongue walketh through the earth." They say, Let God, if He pleases, speak for Heaven, but our voice shall be sovereign in the Earth. It is

---

has been justly objected to as assigning to אֶרֶץ a sense it cannot bear. That word, says Hengstenberg, "never denotes the earth as *matter*. For that the Hebrews have a special word, אֲדָמָה: for example, 'man is of the earth,' taken *ex humo*, could not be expressed by אֶרֶץ, but only by מִן הָאֲדָמָה." See also Delitzsch, who says "אֶרֶץ does not denote the earth as a material, and therefore cannot mean an earthy element." I do not, however, accept the translation of the passage that either of these writers have given as a whole. They do not concur with each other, or, in my judgment, with the truth.

Digitized by Google

therefore our paramount duty, whenever God speaks of what men call "scientific and natural truths," to uphold the strict accuracy, and veracity, and authority of His statements. It is true that it is not the object of the Scripture to teach scientific truth, or to train men in the wisdom of this world; yet all that God does say respecting natural things, scientific or historic, is truth, pure and holy, necessary to teach us what we need to be taught: necessary to make the man of God "throughly furnished unto every good work." In nothing must we despise or lightly esteem the words of God, whether they treat of things in earth, or things in Heaven. Seeing then that the words of God respecting the creation of the Heavens and Earth have been especially assailed in recent times, and seeing that even those who fear Him have been often careless and inexact in their interpretations of the commencing chapters of God's Word, it seems needful to examine with especial care the meaning of the words, and the structure and connection of the sentences.

The first word we have to consider is בּרא, in our version rightly translated "*created*": in the Septuagint, "*made*," εποιησε.

This rendering of the Septuagint Translators must be regarded as deliberately intended. They were, no doubt, afraid lest, if they used "create" [κτιζω] they might be understood as *limiting* the force of בּרא to production out of nothing. Whilst intending to include that sense, they wished also to indicate

Digitized by Google

that ברא as used in Genesis denotes more than production out of nothing—that it indicates *also* the complete formation and making of that which was produced out of nothing. In thus extending the meaning of ברא they were unquestionably right. Nevertheless, the translation is to be regretted; for it is a comment rather than a translation. God has not in this verse used עשׂה *to make*, but ברא *to create:* and although it is true that there is a passage in Genesis ii. (to which I will presently refer) that inseparably associates "create" and "make"; and although in many other passages they may almost be said to be used interchangeably, yet we may be sure that God would not have used two words if one would have sufficed. Consequently, in passages where God has used ברא *to create*, we should not translate as if had used עשׂה *to make.* When He has said "*make*" we should use "*make*"; and when He has said "*create*" we should use "*create.*" It is true, indeed, that when applied in Scripture to the work of God, neither of these words is used without *associating* with itself the thoughts expressed by the other. The thought of making *in completeness*, is associated with the thought of *producing out of nothing*, and *vice versâ.* Yet this does not imply that the words are strictly synonymous. When "create" is used, our minds are especially directed to the fact that the matter operated on, and also the instrumental agencies needed to operate *formatively* on such matter, are alike produced out of nothing by the power of God: whereas the word "make"

Digitized by Google

directs our minds to the power of God in ordering and controlling the *formative* energies so as to effectuate the designed result. Nevertheless, when applied to the "genesis," or "generation" of the Universe, "make" is used not less comprehensively than "create"; and "create" not less comprehensively than "make." When the Scriptures speak of God as *the Maker* of all things, they express the same truth as when they speak of Him as *the Creator* of all things. The texts which I will subsequently quote will sufficiently prove this.

I must, however, first state that there is nothing in the *etymology** of the word ברא to prove that it means to produce out of nothing. The contextual association of words, not their derivations, must, in each several case, determine their meaning. In the present case there can be no difficulty. The Scripture reveals that there is One only *Eternal* Being. One only that is "from everlasting." One only that can say of Himself that He is the inhabiter of Eternity. (Isaiah lvii. 15.) He only is the Self-Existent One: and in virtue of that fact every thing else that existeth must owe its existence

* Neither by the etymology of this word (which some have vainly endeavoured to trace) nor by the uniformity of its use in Scripture can it be proved that it always includes in its meaning the thought of production out of nothing. It is, indeed, true that in Kal it always expresses that thought; but in Pihel it is used more widely, and is applied to mere human agency; but when applied to those operations of the Eternal Self-Existent One who called all things into being, it can only have one meaning.

Digitized by Google

to Him: "By Him all things became to be" [*παντα εγενετο*]. Consequently, "create" when applied to God (and the like may be said of "make") *must* include the thought of producing out of nothing, whatsoever else may be implied. The great truth that there is One only Self-Existent Being necessitates our saying that everything we behold, or think of, as created or made, must have been created or made out of nothing, otherwise God would not have been the alone Self-Existent One. "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed (*καταρτισθαι*, observe the force of this word) by the word of God, so that the things seen did not come into existence (*γεγονεναι*) out of things that did appear." In other words, "out of non-existences existences became to be." This certainly is creation out of nothing. Whatever, therefore, may be meant by ברא or עשׂה in other applications, they can only have one sense in their application to the creative work of God.

The verse to which I have above referred as inseparably associating "CREATE" and "MAKE" is the third verse of Genesis ii.

"And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it He rested from all His work which God CREATED and MADE."

The association of these two words is even more marked in the Hebrew than it is in our own Version. The gerundial form of the infinitive is used, ברא לעשׂות. "It is a construction," (I quote from Gesenius), "in which two verbs are used to express one idea. . . .

Digitized by Google

When one verb serves to complete the idea of another . . . it stands in the infinitive preceded by ל." (Gesenius Gr. § 139.) Accordingly Gesenius translates the words we are considering, "*produced by making*": Delitzsch, "*created by making*": others, "*created in making*." All these translations, it will be observed, inseparably associate the acts of *creating* and *making*. "Completively created"* are words which might perhaps suitably convey the meaning; at any rate, they indicate the thoughts that must be associated with ברא in Genesis i. and ii. In these chapters CREATE cannot imply *merely* production out of nothing, or be used of anything that is not brought into its perfected form of being so as to be fully "*made*." The words already quoted from Hebrews xi. corroborate this statement: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed [*καταρτισθαι, fully formed and fitted*] by the word of God." What word can more strongly imply completeness of construction than *καταρτιζω*.† See also Isaiah, where it is said of man, "I created him for my glory, I

* I take the opportunity of correcting a translation of these words given by me in a former pamphlet. Instead of rendering them "completively created," I have there said "creatively made." Both statements are true, but the former is the correct one. The gerundial form is given to עשׂוה, not to ברא.

† *καταρτιζω*, whether applied to original construction or to renovation, denotes, in either case, that that spoken of is brought into complete adaptation to the purpose for which it is designed. See abundant examples in Stephens' "Thesaurus"; also Liddell and Scott.

Digitized by Google

formed him, yea, I made him." "Create," as applied to Adam, was a completed "making."

Compare also Isaiah lxv. 17, and Rev. xxi. 5, two passages in which the same event, viz., the creation of the New Heavens and New Earth, is spoken of. Isaiah lxv. 17, "Behold *I create* [ברא] New Heavens and a New Earth." Rev. xxi. 5, "Behold, I *make* [ποιεω] all things new." That which is called an act of *creation* in Isaiah is described as a "*making*" in Revelation.

See likewise how closely these words are associated in Genesis ii. 4: "These are the generations of the Heavens and the Earth when they were CREATED, in the day that the Lord God MADE the Earth and the Heavens."

So also the words which God Himself spake on Sinai. The word MAKE is alone used. "In six days the Lord MADE Heaven and Earth, the sea and all that in them is." Are we to exclude the thought of "creating' from the six days' making? That is impossible: for in the description of the six days' making in the first of Genesis the word "create" is many times used: first, when God "created" those things wherewith the waters swarmed (verse 21), and again twice in connection with the creation of man, where also it is expressly associated with "make." "And God said, Let us MAKE man . . . So God CREATED man . . . in the image of God CREATED He them." We can scarcely question that the consideration of these and

Digitized by Google

such like texts induced the Septuagint Translators to use "make" instead of "create" as their rendering of ברא in Genesis i. 1.

The first verse of Genesis i. must therefore be regarded as *prefatory and titular.* It is intended to stand alone, and declares the subject-matter of the two chapters to be the *perfected creation* of the Adamic Universe; even as the first verse of the second chapter states: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them,"* that is, all things that in them were. The καταρτίζω of Hebrews xi. agrees with the כלה of this verse in Genesis. Both imply *completeness* of creation.

Yet very seldom has this verse been regarded as simply *titular.* Commonly it has been looked on as dependent on the second, so that when the earth came into existence (היתה, εγενετο) formless and empty (as the second verse states), then its "creation" as mentioned in the first verse is supposed to have been accomplished. But, though the *second* verse speaks of the first step in the Creation of the Heavens and Earth (that is to say, of the Adamic Universe) as being the production of the unformed substance of the earth, the Scripture does not speak of that first step as being the period of the Heaven's and Earth's *creation.* The Heavens were not called

* Πας ὁ κοσμος αυτων—all the things wherewith they were furnished, supplied and brought into their appointed order. This *order* has been as regards the earth overthrown and at the Flood destroyed; but the earth itself was not destroyed.

Digitized by Google

into existence until the second day; nor is the period when the earth was brought into existence "formlessness and emptiness" spoken of as being its "creation." On the contrary, we find in Isaiah xlv. 18 these words—"He [the Lord] created it not emptiness."* It came into existence (היתה, *εγενετο*) emptiness (Genesis i. 2), but whilst in that inchoate state it is not regarded as "*created*." The second verse of Genesis, therefore, does not describe a condition consequential on the accomplishment of the verse that precedes. Not only the words just quoted from Isaiah xlv. 18, but grammatical precision also forbid the thought. If the second verse had been consequential on the first, we might almost certainly affirm that the consecution (for it would have been a most important truth) would have been *marked*, and therefore the future tense—the tense employed in Hebrew to emphasise consequential result, would have been used; whereas we have the *past* tense. Nor is היתה used in Hebrew any more than *γινομαι* in Greek to represent the *logical copula* "was." In Greek, *εγενετο* is the proper rendering of היתה, not *ην*. If then we paraphrase (observe, I say, *paraphrase*, not *translate*), if we paraphrase the commencing verses of

* תהו, the very same word that is used in Genesis. The faulty translation of this verse in Isaiah, in our Authorised Version, is greatly to be regretted. The Revised Version, though it strangely places the old rendering in the margin, renders "created it not a waste"; nor can it be rendered otherwise. We should have found ל prefixed if the other meaning had been intended.

Digitized by Google

Genesis, their statement is this—At the commencement of the associated condition of the Heavens and Earth God completively created them.* And the order was this. First, the substance of the earth came into being. It came into being (literally it "became to be") shapelessness and emptiness—a fluid chaotic mass, and over it the Spirit of God hovered. There was no light, but God proceeded to say (here we see the force of the *progressive* future continued through the chapter)—"Let there be light," etc., and, as He spake, so order and life appeared; and at the end of

* Some Hebrew scholars (Ewald, for example) contend that the form of בראשית, as being in the construct form, should be noted. It takes from the expression "*in the beginning*" its indefiniteness, and forbids its being applied to an unknown and undefined period antecedent to the Adamic creation. It denotes the period when the Heavens by perfected creation, first attained their *associated* existence. "Ewald," says Wright, "considers ראשית as *in the construct*, governing the following clause in the genitive (compare Hosea i. 2), and translates thus: 'In the beginning when God created the Heavens and the Earth, etc.'" Wright adds, ראשית is used *absolutely* in Isaiah xlvi. 10, but not elsewhere. To this subject I hope to recur.

The expression, The Heavens and the Earth, when thus combined (the Heavens being mentioned first) denotes the Adamic Universe as a whole viewed in its completeness. When the order (ταγμα) of their creation is referred to, as in Genesis ii. the form is changed—the Earth being mentioned first and the Heavens last, neither having the article prefixed. (See Genesis ii. 4.) "The day when the Lord God made Earth and Heavens." The Heavens were not brought into existence until the second day.

Digitized by Google

the six days the Heavens and the Earth were completively created and made. The rules of grammar and the definitions of Scripture alike forbid any interpretation other than this. The first verse of Genesis was not fulfilled until the six days' work of creation closed. *Then*, the Heavens and Earth (an expression denoting the Adamic Universe in its associated condition when perfected) were completively "created." The right interpretation, therefore, of ברא *to create*, is of itself sufficient to destroy all the delusive notions that have of late years been cherished respecting the application of the first verse of Genesis to a chaotic period antecedent to the six days' creation of this chapter. If there had been such a creation, it must have been a *completed* creation both of Heavens and Earth; and that creation must have perished, and the second verse must have described that condition of ruin out of which the present Heavens and Earth must have been created. Now this is impossible, because the present Heavens and Earth are declared in Revelation to be the *first* Heavens and Earth, which could not be if there had been an antecedent creation revealed in the first verse of Genesis, and subsequently destroyed. A right rendering of ברא and a right rendering of היתה would effectually nullify these imaginations. The word ברא is incapable of being applied to the bringing into existence a chaotic mass; and Isaiah says the Earth was not "*created*" a chaotic mass.

Digitized by Google

§ III.

In the history of Christianity there have been few things more painful or (I might say) more terrifying to witness, than the facility with which belief in the truthfulness of the commencing chapters of Genesis has been abandoned by persons who still profess to revere the Scripture, and to receive it as veritably the Word of God. Such abandonment there must be, if we consent to receive the dogmas of any present school of Geological Science. With those dogmas the statements of Scripture, as given either at Sinai or in Genesis, cannot be reconciled. A gulf that cannot be passed yawns betwixt the declarations of the Bible and the assertions of Geology. Elijah and the prophets of Baal were not separated by a more impassable barrier. Woe be to those who seek to unite things that God has sundered. Contrarieties, whether physical or moral, *are* contrarieties. Light is not darkness: life is not death: truth is not falsehood: Heaven is not hell: God is not Satan. The accredited statements of Geology nullify Scripture.* We cannot follow both; and if we abandon Scripture we abandon God.

* If any who read these lines think my assertion false or extravagant, I would entreat them to read *carefully* the remarks written by me some years ago on an article published in "Essays and Reviews," entitled "Mosaic Cosmogony." The pamphlet can be obtained at Houlston & Sons, Paternoster Square. See advertisement at end of this Pamphlet.

Digitized by Google

At the end of this section I will make a few extracts from the pamphlet referred to in the note (page 27). I do not deny that the Essayists do fairly state what the declarations of God at Sinai, and in Genesis really are. The Divine statements are not misrepresented. The Essayists rightly say that the account of Creation as given in Scripture *professes* to be a plain historic narrative of facts; consequently, according to that *profession* it must be judged. To this, all who fear God and reverence His word will readily assent. We admit that all that God has stated respecting the mode and order of His creative power in forming the Paradisiacal Earth is historically stated and that He intends that His words should be literally interpreted and received. Let it be observed, however, that we are speaking now, not of the Earth as *fallen*, but of the Earth *in its primitive condition*, when it came bright, beautiful, and perfect from its Creator's hand. From pole to pole, life, order, peace and perfectness reigned. Destruction, corruption, and death, were unknown. Curse was unknown. Such was the condition of the Earth that God created; but is that the condition of the Earth about which Geologists theorise? We are living now in a fallen, blighted, and stricken Earth—an Earth smitten with a prostrating stroke of judgment, because of man's transgression—an Earth subjected to vanity, and groaning in servitude to corruption. Such is God's own description of the Earth as it *now* is: but this *was not its primitive*

Digitized by Google

condition. It is the same Earth, indeed, but as to its condition it is essentially and radically altered. Its bowels, its strata, its crust, its surface, and all things thereon manifested, are radically changed; and that by a judicial act of God "subjecting" it to the bondage of corruption. "The whole creation groaneth," says the Apostle. Unless we blind our eyes and deafen our ears, we must see the ruin, and hear the universal groan. The presence of joy, perfectness and peace, we see not. Can there be a blindness more terrible than that which prevents our recognising the difference between an unfallen and a fallen Earth? Yet such blindness must fall on us if we follow the course of human thought around us. We shall soon learn to speak proudly about things that we know not, and confront with speculations the testimonies of God. Do we not thereby become His adversaries? And what is the doom of His adversaries? We read of a "fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation that shall devour them." God speaks of an unfallen Earth—men of an Earth that has fallen. The subject-matter is different: how can the statements agree? Men refuse to recognise this obvious fact. If they would recognise it they would soon discern the wisdom of silence; for, seeing that of the original condition of the Paradisiacal Earth, they can, in detail, know next to nothing, and seeing that the operation of the hand of God in judgment, when He changed order into confusion is utterly unknown to them,

how can they assume to know things impossible to be known? We know as much of the condition of the Paradisiacal Earth as we do of the condition of the moon—that is nothing at all. We can, therefore, have no data for premises whence to draw our conclusions. Shall we, with conclusions that must be, even in human judgment, baseless, defy God, and accuse Him of falsehood?

The extracts from my previous Pamphlet are as follows:—

Without touching at present on the geologic phenomena, our first question is whether the word "day" as used in the first of Genesis is capable of being understood of a period of indefinite duration. That it *sometimes* denotes an extended period is true. As in human language, so in Scripture, a prolonged period is often denoted by "day" *when used apart from numerals.* Thus we speak of "the day of man," and of "the day of God:" the day of Solomon, the day of Nebuchadnezzar, and the like. No one doubts that in such uses of "day," an extended period is denoted. Indeed, in the second chapter of Genesis, "day" is used in this general sense, and extended to the whole period of creation. "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, *in the day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." (Gen. ii. 4.) But the case is entirely different when "day," or any other word denoting time is connected with numerals, such as one, two, three: first, second, third, etc. In all such cases "day" is defined and restricted in its application by the numeral appended to it. One day means one day; and six days mean six days; nor is there any departure from this obvious rule from one end of the Scripture to the other.*

* "Our honourable master, Saadias," says Aben Ezra, "expounds correctly and well. . . . . Know also that in

Now I scarcely need say, that in the first of Genesis we have not only a regular succession of days marked by conjoined numerals, "day one," "second day," "third day," and the like, but we have also the word "day" defined as being evening and morning—"the evening and the morning was day one." Nor is this all: as in Genesis so in Exodus, where God Himself speaks from Sinai, we find the seventh day on which God rested, set in contrast with the six preceding days of creation. "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." (Exodus xx. 9, 11.) Will any one deny

---

Holy Scripture days are always days and never years. Yet it is possible that the word 'days' may mean an entire year, since the repetition of the days produces a return of the year, as when it is said in Ex. xiii. 10, from days to days, *i.e.*, from year to year; days meaning a complete year. But when the number is stated as two days, three days, it cannot mean years, but must be days as it stands."

See also Daniel viii. 13, 14: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." "Evenings and mornings" is the expression used in the Hebrew, rendered by our translators "days." I suppose no one will venture to say that each of the 2300 "evenings and mornings" here denotes a period of unlimited duration. In that case Methuselah's life must be as nothing compared with that of that person, yet to come, who is to act in Jerusalem during the 2,300 "evenings and mornings" here spoken of.

Digitized by Google

that the sabbatical day as observed by Israel was not a day of twenty-four hours? and, if this be so, the question is settled. Language, indeed, must cease to be a guide, if *in the same context* the seventh day of a series is to be regarded as a *literal* day, and the six preceding days of *the same series* regarded as periods of indefinite duration. Besides, as is observed by the Essayists (no friends to Scripture), the bare theory that a day means an age or immense geological period might be made to yield some rather strange results. "What becomes of the "evening and morning of which each day is said to have "consisted? Was each geologic age divided into two long "intervals, one all darkness the other all light? And, if so, "what became of the plants and trees created in the third day "or period, when the evening of the fourth day (the evenings, "be it observed, precede the mornings) set in? They must have "passed through half a seculum of total darkness, not even "cheered by that dim light which the sun, not yet completely "manifested, supplied on the morning of the third day. Such an "ordeal would have completely destroyed the whole vegetable "creation, and yet we find that it survived, and was appointed "on the sixth day as the food of men and animals. In fact we "need only substitute the word 'period' for 'day' in the "Mosaic narrative to make it very apparent that the writer at "least had no such meaning, nor could he have conveyed any "such meaning to those who first heard his account read." (*Essays and Reviews*, p. 240.) We are justified then, I think, in rejecting this theory without further remark. If we could believe that each of the six days mentioned in Genesis denoted a period of, perhaps, 10,000 years, and that such period was divided into a night of 5,000 years, and into a day of 5,000 years, and that vegetable and subsequently animal life existed during such nights and such days, we certainly should excel in credulity, but it, I think, would be the credulity of folly —not of wisdom. Wisdom is only credulous when it knows that God hath spoken.

Digitized by Google

* * * * *

Faith is not superstitious credulity. It seeks for evidence, and that evidence God supplies. The *external* evidence* by which the authority of the Old and New Testaments is proved, is such as no sane mind that duly weighs it could honestly reject. And when we add to this the internal evidence (that which is appreciable only by those who, being taught by the Spirit of God, are able to understand the things about which God writes) the demonstration is complete. "If any man," said the Lord Jesus, "will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." When the heart has once learned to trust God, and to listen to the instruction of His word respecting sin, and atonement, and salvation—when it has indeed discovered that nothing but sovereign grace, freely saving on the ground of Another's merits, can meet a sinner's need, it will soon find in the Scripture evidences of its Divine authority multiplied on every page. To one instructed in the school of God the Scripture as it is read supplies each moment demonstrative evidence of its Divine authority, just as harmony in music proves its own presence to the instructed ear. A Christian who really searches the Scripture *as a whole*—who remembers that the Prophets, as well as the Apostles, have written for our learning—will find in all that has happened and is happening to the Church, and to Israel, and to the nations, fresh evidence every day that the Scripture is indeed the work of Omniscience. Yet though conscious of being instructed, he knows that he is instructed only partially: what he understands, he knows that he understands only in part. He pretends to no completeness of knowledge. He knows too that God has not given him any warrant to expect that conclusions based by men on the accuracy of their own

* See as *an example* of this kind of evidence an excellent "Defence of the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel," in "Remarks on the Prophetic Visions of the Book of Daniel," by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D., page 227. This "Defence" is also published separately by Bagster.

Digitized by Google

historic records, or on the evidence of supposed philosophic facts will be found in accordance with His own Word. He knows that often he may have to say, "Let God be true, and every man a liar:" in a word, he is content to walk not by sight, but by faith.

The readiness, and indeed eagerness, which even true Christians have shown in bending and twisting the words of Scripture so as to force them into apparent accordance with the supposed facts of Geology, or rather with the inferences that geologists have made from these facts real or supposed, has brought great sin upon the Church of God—a sin which even still seems little recognised or repented of. And what has been gained by this desertion of the literal truthfulness of God's word? Has its abandonment appeased the fierce wrath of the enemies of Truth? Has it turned aside the fury of their assault? No. It has given them fresh vigour, and furnished them with new weapons wherewith to assail our citadel. It has caused Infidelity to exalt itself more proudly, and to boast that it has succeeded at last in convicting of falsehood the God of holiness and truth. "I have adverted" (says one of the Essayists now no more) "to the question of "discrepancies between science and the language of Scripture "generally, and have referred more especially to that notable "instance of it—the irreconcilable contradiction between the "whole view opened to us by geology, and the narrative of the "Creation in the Hebrew Scriptures, whether as briefly deli-"vered from Sinai or as expounded in Genesis. In the minds "of *all competently informed persons* at the present day, after "a long struggle for existence, the literal belief in the Judaical "cosmogony, it may now be said, has died a natural death. Yet "many are still haunted by its *phantom*, which perpetually "disturbs their minds with apprehensions equally groundless "on collateral points."*

* Powell's "Unity of Worlds," p. 457.

Digitized by Google

Awful words these! They assert not only that the words which Moses was inspired to write are false, but also that that which God himself audibly spoke on Sinai is false. He indeed who dared to write these things is now no more—his lips are silent in death: but the sentiment survives, and is by multitudes received and welcomed; and even they who receive it *not*, seem little to *feel* its awfulness; or if they feel it, are too inert or too timorous to give vigorous expression to what they feel, and to encounter the consequences of faithful action.*

---

* One writer on Geology observes, that if certain operations be allowed to be miraculous (he is speaking of the Flood) "then we must give up the idea of philosophising about it, and believe the facts simply on the Divine testimony. For how can we philosophise upon an event that is brought about by the direct efficiency of God, and without reference to existing natural laws, and, it may be, in contravention of them," etc. (*Hitchcock's Religion of Geology*, p. 114.) This is just the simple truth. It seems, indeed, little short of madness, to affirm, with the Scriptures in our hand, that the operations of God at the Creation, at the Fall, at the Flood, at the descent on Sinai, and on other occasions of which we have no detailed record, were the result of the operation of mere ordinary natural laws with which we are familiar, and that His agency was not in the full sense *miraculous*. And if it be *miraculous*, then by the confession of Dr. Hitchcock himself, there is an end to philosophising. To admit that there is an Almighty Being, and yet to aver that He did not act *miraculously* on the occasions referred to, is as contrary to right reason as it is to revelation. And what am I asked to believe when I discard miraculous agency and admit the fancied mythical agencies of the geologists? I must believe "that the epoch of the earth's creation is unrevealed" (*Hitchcock, Lect. II.*)—that "death" (which Scripture declares to have entered by one man's sin) "was a universal law of organic

Digitized by Google

Geology, like astronomy, or any other such science, whilst it employs itself in the ascertainment of facts is innocent, and useful for the purposes of life; but the moment it quits this comparatively lowly path and is tempted, instead of collecting and registering facts, to substitute conjecture and hypothesis for facts, and to endeavour to account for its facts by unproved theories, it abandons the sphere of inductive science, and becomes the slave and dupe of vain, empty, deceiving speculativeness. One has to seek among the sophists of Athens, or the Gnostics of Alexandria for parallels to the grandiloquent self-complacency displayed by those who have been during the last few weeks magnifying their discoveries of flint spear-heads, and arrow-heads, and bones of pre-Adamic men in the caves of Abbeville. The ἀλαζονεία of these writers (not to speak of their disdainful rejection of Scripture) would be in itself enough to disgust and alienate any right-toned mind. Nor are they agreed as to their facts. One might smile (if the subject were not too solemn) to see how the statements of one week by one writer, are set aside the next week by another. Yet both alike are positive. Are we to humble and abase the banner of God's Truth in the presence of men like these? And even supposing that we could ascertain with

---

beings on the globe from the beginning" (*Hitchcock, Lect. III.*) —that the Flood was limited in extent, prevailing only in the districts contiguous to Armenia, and that it was not destructive of *all* human and animal life (*Hugh Miller, Testimony of Rocks*, p. 346.—*Hitchcock, Lect. IV. and various other writers*) —and that it is doubtful whether it be possible to identify one mark of that event (the Noachic Deluge) in nature (*Hitchcock*, p. 111). We are asked to admit all this, and many other like things (all falsifying Scripture) and to reject the thought of miraculous agency on the part of God, in order that Geologists may not be obstructed in inventing mythical theories to *account for* their real, or supposed facts.

Digitized by Google

perfect certainty every present fact connected with the earth's physical condition, would such an induction enable us to determine the times and the causes of the phenomena thus presented? Evidently not: for the simple reason, that even if our induction of facts were perfect (and who would assert the possibility of this?) yet even then, unless we had access to a sphere of knowledge entirely beyond the scope of human intelligence, we should be utterly unable to account with certainty for our facts, or to form conclusions as to the causes and times of the phenomena before us. Geologists in affirming that this earth was created before the time at which God says it was created, ground their assumption in part on the discovery of certain phenomena, which they say prove that the earth once existed in a very different condition from that in which we now behold it; and that it is very evident that some great act of destruction, either universal, or well nigh universal, has spread ruin over it; and then come their various theories to account for the appearances they have discovered. But what weight can any one of these theories have with us, when once we discover that one of the points most material in the consideration of such a question is omitted altogether? This *adamic* earth—the earth whose creation is described in the first of Genesis, came into existence in a condition utterly different, *circumstantially*, from that in which we now behold it. Have geologists ever thought of defining, or are they able to define with accuracy the condition of the paradisiacal earth? Have they ever thought of contrasting with the condition of this fallen earth as we now know it, its unfallen paradisiacal form when it first came fair, and perfect, and blessed, from the hand of its Creator? Never. I never heard of one geological writer that has even endeavoured to say in what respects the present condition of this earth contrasts with its pristine condition of perfectness. They have evidently never reflected on the subject—it has had no place in their thoughts. In all thir discussions they have overlooked the all-important fact that

Digitized by Google

this earth has had, not *one unchanged condition*, but *two contrasted conditions* of existence since its Creator brought it into being in the six literal days described in Genesis. It is the same earth, indeed, but circumstantially how changed! Any theory, therefore, that pretends to account for the earth's present physical condition, if it ignore the greatness of that change which took place at the Fall (and all present geological theories do) must be utterly worthless. It cannot even have *the semblance* of plausibility to a reflective mind. The great and all important period of change in the whole fabric of creation at the time when man fell, and sin and death entered, and when God, as the Scripture tells us, subjected all creation "to the bondage of corruption"—that period and its resulting consequences, they utterly ignore.

The Scripture tells us that "by one offence"—the one transgression of Adam—death entered and reigned. (See Rom. v. 12 and 17.) To this statement I strictly adhere. The Scriptures do not limit the reign of death and of corruption to man, and facts prove that it is not limited to man. Am I to be told that the God of life and goodness created this earth with one thing in it that was marked by ruin or death? How in that case could He have pronounced it "very good"—how could He have rejoiced in and rested in it? It would not have been very good: He could not have rested in it. We know that at present "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together": but it was not created in this travail. A judicial act of God, in consequence of the first man's sin, has subjected it to "the bondage of, or enslavement to, corruption"—a strong expression, from which, however, through the Second Man, it will, by and by, be delivered. What I maintain, then, is, that up to the period of Adam's sin, all in creation was positively perfect. I maintain that up to that time, no death, no decay, or dissolution, no process involving the destruction of life, no effects or consequences of destructive judgment, existed either amongst animals or men.

Digitized by Google

Nothing that spoke of ruin was presented to the eye or to the thought of angel or of man, for no such thing existed. Not only the surface of the earth, but the earth's lowest parts down to its inmost centre were marked, not by traces of convulsion, distortion, and fiery dissolution, as they *now* are, but by the presence of absolute perfectness, bearing witness to the life-giving and sustaining power of God. But when man sinned, and when with him creation fell, all was changed. He whose almighty fiat had called light into being, appointed now by a like act of almighty power that death should penetrate and reign over all things. Inward fires that before had never operated to destroy, were now caused to rage destructively within the earth's bowels. The fact that they do there rage destructively, even philosophy admits, and every volcano proves.* Does any one believe that these raging fires burnt within the earth's bowels at first, or that the traces of their agency as seen in fused mountains thrown up upon the earth's surface,† were found marking upon the earth the stamp of

---

* "Let us take the extreme estimate of forty miles as the depth below which the matter composing the earth is completely liquefied [by fire]. This depth is the one-hundredth part of the terrestrial radius. We are then to regard the earth as a spherical shell of solid matter filled with liquid fire. . . . . If the egg of a fowl or an ostrich be imagined to represent the earth, its shell would be much too thick to represent the earth's solid crust!" (Earthquakes and Volcanoes, Lardner's "Popular Geology," § 8.)

† "The central fluid [fiery] matter, pressing unequally on its confining shell, has at various times cracked it in different directions, and the molten mineral matter, issuing from the fissures, and gradually cooling . . . . has formed mountain chains over the fissures. Such has been the operation by which the vast ridges of the Andes, which traverse the new continent from north to south, and those of the Alps and

Digitized by Google

judgment, when first it existed in its pristine paradisiacal perfectness? Is it not a fact, plainly attested by Scripture, that Sheohl or Hades (in the lowest division of which, called in Scripture "the lowest Hades," the departed souls of the wicked are at present confined) is formed within the earth's bowels? Surely no such place, indicative of the triumph of sin and death, could have existed when all throughout the whole creation was good, perfect, and blessed. No place of anguish—no *penal* prison-house, nor indeed any prison-house can be supposed to have existed in the bowels of the earth then. But this globe, once appointed to be the witness of the life-giving power of God for good, has since become a witness of His destructive power in judgment. What part of the earth's crust (for since Sheohl or Hades was formed, and internal fires began to operate destructively, the earth is but a crust) does not bear witness to the action of violent and destructive agencies, not only by contortion, dislocation, and the like, but by their very constitution? How then can we suppose that any such appearances in the earth's strata existed when first the earth came into its perfected being and was pronounced very good? A direct intervention from God (an intervention not less miraculous, and *possibly* less prolonged, than that which first called the earth into being) smote it with the stroke of judgment—a stroke that doubtless penetrated like an electric shock into its lowest parts. At first the earth was adapted to the condition which man held in happiness and innocency; afterwards it became altered to meet the condition of man as fallen, and was subjected to the reign of death,—even the very dislocation of the earth's strata and their arrangements (the place of coal-fields, metalliferous districts, and the like) being doubtless appointed with anticipative reference to the need of man *as fallen*, and with a certa

---

Himalaya, which traverse the old continents from east to west, have been formed." (Ibid., § 10.)

Digitized by Google

reference too, to the destined place which each nation and tribe should hold in human history till the great end shall come. The mere circumstance then, that all present geologic theories ignore these truths, and give no place to the great fact of creation being subjected to the bondage of corruption and the reign of death, is in itself sufficient to invalidate their conclusions.

* * * * *

Whenever geologists are able to declare with precision the exact condition and constitution of the paradisiacal earth—when they are able to tell the mode, extent, and results of the change in the earth's condition at the fall of man, when creation was first subjected to the bondage of corruption—when they can describe the manner of the formation of Sheohl (Hades) within the earth's bowels, and the effects thereby produced on the earth's surface—when they can tell me what is meant in Scripture by Hades "enlarging herself" (see Is. v. 14) and all the effects of such enlargement—when they can tell me whether the axis of the earth was, at its creation, inclined, as now, to its orbit; and if not, when the inclination took place, and the effects thereby produced—when they can declare the character, and results, of all the convulsions that have visited this earth *since the fall*, especially at the time when God descended on Sinai, and shook the whole earth in a manner comparable to that last great shaking which is yet to be—when they can explain to me the manner and extent of the change that has passed on animals now known as carnivorous, but which once ate the herb of the field (see Gen. i. 30), and which, in time yet to come, shall again feed thereon (Is. xi. 7)—when they can tell me whether the moon (whose light in the coming millennial age will be as the light of the sun) and whether the sun (whose light in that coming age will be sevenfold augmented, see Is. xxx. 26) had a similar or greater brilliancy and heat in the paradisiacal period, and what

Digitized by Google

were the consequences as to climate, etc., of such heat and brilliancy—when they can tell me whether the physical laws affecting the distribution of heat and cold, the formation of strata, the growth and multiplication of plants and animals, the corrosion of rocks, etc., etc., were the same in the antediluvian age (when man's longevity was so great) as now—when they can declare on what occasions and in what manner God has employed *miraculous* agency in the arrangement or disarrangement of the earth's strata—when they can declare all that He may thus have done, secretly and without the cognisance of man, at the time of the Fall, and at the Flood, and at the descent on Sinai—when these, and other like questions have been satisfactorily answered, then we may admit that geologists are competent to account for, and to form theories on, their facts. But till that time comes (and it never will come to uninspired man) the acceptance of conclusions which require for their establishment the possession of Divine wisdom, would be unpardonable fatuity, even if such conclusions did not expressly contradict the Scripture—but what shall we say when we find that these conclusions are at utter variance with Holy Writ, and necessitate by their reception the rejection of the Word of the living God?

The Earth we now inhabit is no longer in its primeval condition. Its centre, its crust, and its surface have been radically changed. Ruin, destruction, and corruption reign, where ruin, destruction, and corruption were not. The reason of the change we know. The extent and character of the change, and the agency by which it was effected, we know not. Present facts can be ascertained and registered, but beyond that we cannot go. We might as well theorise respecting the strata, or icebergs, or rivers of the Moon. To draw conclusions from premises that

Digitized by Google

neither have been, nor can be proved, is madness: but when such conclusions are made the ground of arraigning God, and rejecting the truthfulness of His Word, what shall we say? Will the lies be found with God or with man? Have we estimated the woe that must fall on him who striveth with his Maker?

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

I.—USE OF THE HEBREW FUTURE.

IT must not be supposed that the conclusions to which the *preceding* observations lead are founded on disputable niceties of grammatical construction. They rest on a far wider basis. They rest on revealed facts, solid and incontrovertible. Yet grammatical accuracy is not to be despised. It is not unimportant to inquire whether our grammatical knowledge, as it increases in accuracy, jars with our conclusions or corroborates them. I venture to say that it corroborates.

I am quite aware that in touching on the force of the Hebrew tenses, and on questions connected with the supposed force of *Vav conversive*, I am entering debateable ground. On these and kindred questions, neither Jewish nor Gentile scholars are agreed. It is therefore not only permissible, but desirable, that each one should examine the various questions for himself; and although in the present state of our inductions we may hesitate in laying down universal rules, and may expect and welcome corrections on points of detail, yet we may be very sure that increased accuracy will bring with it increased certainty. My object, therefore, in making the remarks I am now making is not to dogmatise or to present a system that claims to be unassailable, much less perfect. I desire merely to offer some

Digitized by Google

suggestions that may tend to throw some light on vexed questions.

It is very obvious that the idioms of different languages greatly vary. All have their own peculiarities. The idioms of the East differ much from those of the West. In translating, therefore, we must not seek to transfer the idioms of one language into the expressions of another. Intolerable harshness, as well as awkwardness in the arrangement of words and sentences, would be the result. Accordingly we adopt, as far as possible, the idioms of the language into which we are translating. The English language may use a *past* tense where the Hebrew uses a *future*, or *vice versâ*; for the tenses of one language may have an elasticity of application or an extension of meaning, which the corresponding tenses of the language into which we are translating have not. Hebrew, for example, may be accustomed to use *futures* where our language uses *pasts* or *presents*. In such a case we must, in translating, adhere to our own idiom, and use the past or the present where Hebrew uses the future. But we must not on that account say that the Hebrew future ceases to be future, and becomes changed into a *present* or past tense. Yet this has been said; and by the theory of the *Vav conversive* and other means, the Hebrew tenses have been so manipulated that some have doubted whether Hebrew tenses have, as to time, any fixed signification at all. But it is far otherwise. Hebrew, as clearly as any other lan-

Digitized by Google

guage, expresses the three great thoughts of present, past, and future. It is true indeed that the distinctions and modifications expressed in Greek and other western languages by an enlarged number of tenses (pluperfect, imperfect, aorist, etc.), and also by a variety of moods, are, in Hebrew, not denoted by change of inflexion, or form, but yet they are determined by the contextual association in which the verb is found.* There is not in Hebrew any distinct mode of expressing the *futurum exactum*. Yet it often is expressed. The context or associated particles are our guides.

The scope of the Hebrew future is, as I have already said, far more extensive than that of our English future. It is used (as in English) to denote events that are simply indicated as future; but it is also used to denote *progressive* action, especially action that is *dependent or consequent on* something previously spoken of as *anterior* or *causative*, where link follows link as in a chain. It also denotes *continuousness* of existent action and *continuity*, linking various books of Scripture together as parts of one historic record. (See Lev. i. 1 and Ruth i. 1.) † It is likewise used to *mark* and *emphasize* attained

* "The Hebrew language has neither conditional nor subjunctive mood, nor any auxiliary verb corresponding to the English *shall, should; will, would*, etc. . . . . The past and future tenses admit all these shades of tense as the context may require." (Mason & Bernard, Gr., vol. ii. p. 76.)

† Many of the books commence with futures, indicating that they record events that are connected with previous histories.

result. In such cases our language, having no corresponding use of the future, renders it by the past or present. It is a matter of necessity, and must not be complained of; but we are not therefore justified in saying that the Hebrew future is any thing else than a future, or that it is expressing thoughts that are beyond its province. We have rather to say that the Hebrew future has an advantage in expressing thoughts wider than our future is able to convey.

For the sake of those who are unacquainted with Hebrew, I will now give (not a translation but) a grammatical analysis of a few verses in Genesis i., throughout which chapter abundant instances of the future, as indicating *progression*, and *consecution*, occur. A fixed point is first established by the use of the word היה (verse 2) in the past tense. The actions that follow are *future in reference to that fixed past point.* "And God proceeded to say [future], Let Light become to be, and Light proceeded to become to be [future]. And God proceeded to view [future] the Light, that it [was] good; and God proceeded to divide [future] between the Light and the darkness; and God proceeded to call [future] the light Day, and the darkness He called * [not "proceeded to call"; the past tense is used]

* In every case where I have used "proceeded to" do so and so, or "proceeded to become," the *progressive* future is used; the various actions being marked as successive to, if not consequent on each other. But when *concurrency* not *consecution*

Digitized by Google

Night; and evening proceeded to be [future], and morning proceeded to be [future] Day one. And God proceeded to say [future] Let there become a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it become divisive between waters and waters. And God proceeded to make [future] the firmament, and proceeded to divide [future] between the waters which [are] below in relation to the firmament and the waters which [are] above in relation to the firmament; and God proceeded to call [future] the firmament Heavens; and evening proceeded to become [future] and morning proceeded to become [future] Day second."

It is not necessary for me to continue this analysis. Throughout the chapter the future is used to denote progression. In our translation we

---

is intended to be expressed, the *past* tense is employed as in this verse. The act of naming light Day, and darkness Night, are marked as *concurrent*, not consecutive acts. In the tenth verse also we find a like example, "God proceeded to call [future] the dry land Earth, and the gathering together of the waters He [at the same time] called (past tense) Seas." The acts of naming are regarded as concurrent acts. See also Gen. i. 27: "And God proceeded to create [future tense] man in His own image, in the image of God created He him [past tense], male and female created He [past tense] them." "Create," as used twice in the latter part of the verse, refers to an act concurrent with, but not subsequent to, the act referred to by "create" in the commencement of the verse. "Man" is here used in a collective sense.

The logical copula where it occurs, not being expressed in Hebrew, I have enclosed in brackets.

Digitized by Google

rightly enough use the past, for we are unable by our future tense similarly to mark progression. There is an expansiveness in the Hebrew use of the future which our future has not; and, consequently, greater accuracy of statement. I may add that there certainly is no room for the theory of *Vav conversive* in this chapter, and no ground for saying (because our future cannot adapt itself to the elasticity of the Hebrew future) that therefore the Hebrew future is to be shorn of its prerogatives and commuted into a past. It is marvellous that any one should have ventured to propose anything so preposterous.

The following may be enumerated as the chief uses of the future in Hebrew:—

I. It denotes simple *futurity*, as our future in English. See Prov. xii. 13, "The just *shall come* out of trouble." It has also, as our English future, a *jussive* force. "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it." (Gen. iii. 3.)

II. It denotes *progressive*, and *successional*, and *consecutive* action,—future in respect to the point whence such action proceeds. "Most commonly," says Gesenius, "a narrative begins with a preterite, and ends with a future." See Gen. x. 11, "Out of that land went forth [past tense] Asshur, and proceeded to build [future] Nineveh." This may be said to be the predominant use of the future. Thousands of examples are to be found. There are exceptions, but they are easily accounted for.

Digitized by Google

III. It denotes *continuance* or *frequency*. In the case of events of *continual occurrence*, or of *habitual action*, the future is used, although referring them to time past. Thus Ben Zev says, "In a matter that "is wont to occur often, the Future will for the most "part be used in the place of the past, to point to "its continuance and frequency." (See Mason and Bernard's Heb. Gr., vol. ii. pp. 76, 77.) See Gen. xxix. 2, "From that well they used to water [future] the herds." See also Ex. xviii. 26, "The hard causes *they used to bring* [future] to Moses."

IV. In close connection with this expression of frequent or constant occurrence comes its meaning of strict *continuousness*. This is found very frequently in the Psalms: "In His law he will continually meditate day and night" (Ps. i. 2); "I laid me down [past], and went on to sleep [future]: I awaked [past], for the Lord continued to sustain me [future]." (Ps. iii. 5.)

In the Greek Testament we occasionally find the Hebraistic use of the future. Let it be remembered that I am not translating, but analysing only. See Rev. iv. 9, "And when the living creatures proceed to give [δωσουσιν] glory . . . . to Him that sitteth on the Throne . . . . the twenty-four elders proceed to fall down [πεσουνται] . . . . and proceed to worship [προσκυνησουσιν] . . . . and proceed to cast [βαλουσιν] their crowns before the Throne." The futures in this passage have strangely perplexed some. They are evidently expressive of

Digitized by Google

progression and *habitual* action. See also Rom. iii. 30, "Who shall continue to justify [δικαιωσει] the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." Multitudes had been already justified when these words were written; but the gracious process was and still is being continued. So also, Rom. v. 19, "The many [οἱ πολλοι] shall be constituted righteous," *i.e.*, multitudes of believers from among the Gentiles (for such is the meaning of רַבִּים in Isaiah liii. 11, and of οἱ πολλοι here) had been constituted righteous through the obedience of the One Righteous Servant of Jehovah; and the blessed process was not stopped — it is still proceeding. So also, Matt. xvi. 18, "On this Rock *I will* build [οικοδομησω] my Church." The future is used, but it is the *continuous* future: it refers to a process that had been, and that then was, and that would be continued to the end. See also Dan. vii. 17, "These great beasts which are four, are four kings which *successively arise* [such is the force of the future] out of the earth." In Daniel's time one had been, one was, and two were yet to come. This also has perplexed many; but attention to the use of the Hebrew future clears away all the difficulties; nor is there occasion for recurrence to the ו *conversive*, or any other like invention.

I had intended to make some further observations on the jussive force of the future (a force which our English future likewise has), and to remark also on the use of the Hebrew future as marking the *apodosis*

Digitized by Google

of a sentence, and also emphasising the result of a series of actions often expressed by a chain of preceding preterites. As, however, the object of this Appendix is simply to point out the use of the future as implying progression (further, my present argument need not go), I think it best to reserve any remarks I may wish to make on the use of the Hebrew preterite to another occasion. I think I shall be able to show that a comparatively slight alteration in our English version, by introducing, when the Hebrew uses preterites after futures, the future-perfect tense, would not only bring our translation more into harmony with the Hebrew text, but would also give to it more vividness, and at the same time preserve us from the arbitrary commutations acquiesced in by the advocates of the *Vav conversive* system.

If Hebrew be the language which God has especially chosen as the medium of His communications with man, we may expect to find in it traces of its being the adopted language of One whose thoughts, expressions, and methods are altogether diverse from ours. Our mode of apprehending the past, the present, and the future can have no place in the mind of Him who can realise the past and the future as clearly and fixedly as the present. He "who is, and who was, and who is to come," can speak of things "that are not as though they were," and look on future things as already come.* In the visions of

* It is the more important to maintain the great truth of

Digitized by Google

the Prophets sudden transition must be expected, for in vision the future was frequently made to their apprehensions present. In appointing the order of His worship also, as in Leviticus, God can speak of His servants as having fulfilled His will and accomplished His service before their work is absolutely concluded, and to indicate that its effectuation is, even because He has appointed it, certain. It was said of Israel when they were about to enter the wilderness—"Thou *hast guided them* by thy strength unto thy holy habitation. (Exodus xv. 13.)

God's foreknowledge now that it is being denied by philosophers, who still arrogate to themselves the name of "Christian." Thus Dr. James Martineau, as quoted in the *British Weekly* of March 2, 1888, writes as follows:—

"The belief in the Divine Knowledge of our own future "rests chiefly on textual authority, and was consonant with "the narrow, however noble, Hebrew conception of the rela- "tion of Man to God. But it has, it is suggested, no basis "either in philosophy or in piety. The abstention from such "foreknowledge is a self-limitation on the part of God, "sustained, like the partial surrender of His causality, that "there might be scope for the gift of moral freedom to man- "kind. . . . We are no longer to deem that even God sees "the moment in our moral life that is coming next. Even "He does not know whether I shall yield to that secret "temptation at midday. Even He is ignorant whether I shall "do the thing I know I ought to do to-morrow. He watches "with Divine affection and unexhausted interest. To Him, "too, it is not a story told, but a drama, in the acting of "which He knows not the consummation."

Such is "the blackness of darkness" in which they are involved who despise "Textual Authority."

Digitized by Google

So also in the New Testament—"Whom He justified, them He also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.) "It became Him for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, when He brought (*αγαγοντα*) many sons unto glory," etc. (Heb. ii. 10.) The many sons are not even yet *actually* brought unto glory. Whatever God has appointed He has a right to speak of as virtually effectuated.

Moreover, even men, in order to give vividness and force to their injunctions and warnings, often depict the future as past. A father might say to a rebellious son: "Suppose that the step, which thou contemplatest, be taken, I will describe to thee thy condition. Thou hast made thyself master of thy way; thou hast defied my authority; broken every link and spurned every bond. Thou hast become a wanderer; a stranger in a distant land; hast plunged into an abyss of evil and drank of the cup of the world's pleasures. Affliction hath come upon thee; evil hath overtaken thee. Thy friends have deserted thee. Thou hast abandoned God, and God has abandoned thee; and the result, what will that be?" Great vividness and force is gained by such substitution of the past for the future.*

* When the Commandments of the law were first given at Sinai the jussive *future* is used; but when, in Deuteronomy, a description of Israel is given as *ostensibly* and *professedly* keeping and delighting in that law (a description to which they finally will answer) the past tense is used, whereby great force and vividness is given to the picture.

Digitized by Google

I have already observed that the Hebrew future has a *jussive* sense, as also has our English future. Examples of this abound in Scripture. In the ordinances of Leviticus we often find a chain of futures followed by a series of *preterites* pointing to a future end, and the series of preterites closed by a *future* denoting the attained result. This use of preterites in consecution to futures is one of the means by which Hebrew expresses the *futurum exactum*—the perfect future. An example of this will be found in Leviticus xvi. 20. The Hebrew stands thus: "And he (Aaron) hath made an end of reconciling (expiating) the Holy Place," etc. Our English translators (with the view, I suppose, of keeping as closely as possible to the Hebrew idiom) very properly prefix the word "when," and say "When he" (Aaron) "hath made an end of reconciling the Holy Place," etc. In continuing the sentence, however, they should have placed all the subsequent chain of preterites under the same "when," and should have said,

When he shall have made an end of reconciling the Holy Place, etc.

And shall have brought the live goat, etc.

And shall have laid his hands on the head of the live goat, etc.

The same form of translation should have been retained until the end of the chain of preterites (no less than fourteen in number) had been reached and the result, indicated by a future, been at-

Digitized by Google

tained — the result being expressed in the 25th verse— *

THE FAT OF THE SIN-OFFERING HE SHALL BURN UPON THE ALTAR.†

Thus, without adopting the theories about *Vav conversive*, we can admit that preterites can, by their connection with preceding futures, become futurized, yet not so as to have their force as preterites nullified. In the example just given from Leviticus we have a chain of virtually futurized preterites denoting a course of continuous agency carried on till the intended result is attained, that result being marked by a future. Sometimes, however (and there are remarkable examples of this in Deuteronomy), a preterite and not a future is used to denote result. The rule appears to be this. When the resulting effect is to be regarded *mainly* with reference to the agency that has produced it, a future tense is used: but when it is to be regarded *mainly* with reference to the status or condition of the production itself, whether it be person or thing, a preterite is used. Thus in the first Psalm we read—

For seeing that in the Law of Jehovah [is] his delight,

And that in His Law he continueth to meditate day and night,

* The preceding part of this chapter might have been translated on the same principle.

† Burn for fragrance, קטר. Under the ascribed value of that fragrance all believers stand. See Eph. v. 2.

Digitized by Google

He hath therefore become (חיח) like a tree, etc.

In Greek κτισις and κτισμα are both used to denote creation; but the first directs the mind to the agent or agency that produced, the latter to the character and condition of the production. A similar remark may be made respecting a multitude of verbal nouns.

I do not say that there may not be exceptions, apparent if not real, to these and like general rules; but if we remember that in continuous narratives there may be parenthetic clauses, and also that in a chain of futures or of preterites, incidents may be mentioned that are either antecedent to, or else collateral to, or concurrent with, the events that form the chain of consecution, but not themselves forming a part of that chain; and that in such cases a preterite may be found in the midst of a chain of futures, and a future found in the midst of a chain of preterites—if we bear this in mind, I do not think that many difficulties will remain. However, as I have already said, my present object in touching on these subjects is to show the progressive and successional force of the Hebrew future. By the other questions my argument is not affected.

Digitized by Google

II.—"IN THE BEGINNING."

THE difficulties of controversy would often be lessened if we were more careful in defining to ourselves the meaning of the expressions we employ. "Beginning" is a word with which we are very familiar. With it the Scripture opens. But are we accustomed accurately to define its meaning, especially of that grammatical form of the word which is found in the Hebrew ראשית?

We must not forget that there is a condition of existence to which, looked at as it is in itself, the word, "beginning" cannot apply. Eternity has no beginning. "Time, which consisteth of parts, can be no part of infinite duration or eternity."* The Holy One "that inhabiteth Eternity" hath no beginning. It was necessary, therefore, that the Eternal One should perform an act of creation, and bring into existence some thing or person external to Himself before the word "Beginning" could be to anything applied. "Time," "periods," "epochs," "ages," in the sense in which we use such terms, can have no place in that condition of existence that pertains to the Eternal One. He had no beginning. He can have no end. But when He creates, His act of creation first bringeth in a "begin-

* See Grew, as quoted by Johnson in his Dictionary.

Digitized by Google

ning": and that "beginning" constitutes not an indefinite period, unlimited and vague, but it establishes a fixed point, from which point all created intelligences date origin, and the commencement of periods and times.

There was a point in Eternity when God first put forth His power to create, and so brought into existence the angelic world. The length of the period that intervened between the angelic and the Adamic creation we know not. It is not revealed; but the first act in Eternity, that at the time of the creation of the angelic world ushered in created being, marked the point to which the word "beginning" could for the first time be applied. "Beginning" is not, therefore, as some have strangely asserted, a word expressive of "an absolutely boundless past" (that would be a definition of Eternity); but, on the contrary, it indicates a fixed and definite point *in* Eternity. In this sense it is used in the first chapter of the Gospel of John. "In the beginning WAS the Word." WAS (ἦν) here indicates essential and eternal being. The Word was not created: He WAS from everlasting. "The beginning," therefore, spoken of in John was emphatically "THE beginning." Before it there was no "beginning." It referred to that definite moment when Creation first gave birth to that which we call "Time"; and at that moment the Word, being eternal, WAS: a proof of which is, that all created things came into existence (literally, *became to be*,

Digitized by Google

εγενετο) by means of Him, and "apart from Him came into being not even one thing that hath come into being" (και χωρις αυτου εγενετο ουδε εν ὁ γεγονεν). "THE beginning," therefore, mentioned in John, is to be distinguished from that mentioned in Genesis; for it denotes the moment when God was pleased for the first time to call into being other existences than Himself.

The second use of "Beginning" we find in Genesis, when the Creation of the Adamic universe is described. There also its use is precise and definite. It belongs to no "absolutely boundless past," but it is confined to the period when God called into existence a second Creation that He associated, not with *angels*, but with *man*. But in speaking of the second Creation He uses a peculiar form of expression by which Hebrew indicates that the word "Beginning" is not used indefinitely or vaguely, but that its application is restricted to that with which it is, by the context, associated. The context speaks only of the Creation of the Adamic Heavens and Earth; consequently, to that period the word "Beginning" (ראשית) (being, as Grammarians say, in a construct form or in regimine) is limited. There are many, says Calasius, who say that ראשית is always in a construct form ("*Sunt multi qui dicunt* ראשית *semper esse in regimine*:" Calasius Concord., in locum). Few who candidly examine the passages in which this word occurs will deny this. It is never used absolutely, but

Digitized by Google

relatively.* The special limitation of ראשית, therefore, by its constructive form to the period of the creation of the Adamic Heavens and Earth, is an important fact not to be overlooked. It confirms the many arguments by which it is otherwise proved that the combined and perfected Creation of the Heavens and the Earth is the alone subject of the first chapter of Genesis. At the beginning of the associated existence of the Heavens and the Earth, God completively created them. Such is the statement of the first verse of the Bible. It standeth fast for ever.

* Lev. ii. 12; Deut. xxxiii. 21; Is. xlvi. 10, have been deemed by some to be exceptions. But they are not. In all of them ראשית is limited by its contextual associations.

Digitized by Google

III.—THE WORD *ΚΟΣΜΟΣ*,

IN 2 PETER III. 6.

"Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished."

THE words, FIRST Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45) are, as I have already said, sufficient to prove to all those who reverence the Scripture, that there has been no *pre-Adamic* man; and the words FIRST Heavens and FIRST Earth in Revelation (where the present Heavens and Earth are so named) prove that no Heavens and Earth were created previously to "the Heavens and Earth" which we now behold.

"Heavens and Earth," whenever spoken of with reference to the period of their creation, or with reference to the period of their passing away (see Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1), are always spoken of in combination. They were associated when created: they will be associated when destroyed; and the Earth when thus spoken of means not "the dry land" (Gen. i. 9) merely (a meaning which it also bears), but it denotes the whole terraqueous globe that we inhabit, and which has never been destroyed since it was created, nor will be, until the time comes for the creation of the "New Heavens and Earth," which also are always spoken of in combination, and which will abide for ever, standing as they will stand, under

Digitized by Google

the everlasting Headship of the "Second Man"—"the Last Adam."

Nevertheless, men—choosing to form their own theories, and resolved to uphold them at all risks—struggle to destroy these declarations of Scripture. They say, that because the Apostle Peter, in the last chapter of his Second Epistle, speaks of the primeval Earth having been destroyed at the Flood, therefore it is impossible to speak of the present Heavens and Earth being the first Heavens and Earth, although they are so spoken of in the Revelation.

Now if the Apostle Peter had said that the Heavens and the Earth had been destroyed, or even if he had said that the whole terraqueous globe which bears the name of Earth, had been destroyed, there would have been a difficulty. But he has said nothing of the kind. Every one knows that the planet in which we live was not destroyed at the Flood, and certainly the Heavens were not; for the destruction is declared to have been effected by *water;* and the water did not reach the firmament. What the Apostle says is not the Earth (ἡ γη) was destroyed, but .that ὁ κοσμος—the Earth regarded as the ordered abode of animal life—was destroyed. The dry land, and all that breathed thereon was wiped or blotted out, but the substance of the earth remained; and the "seas" remained and the creatures that were therein remained; and the Heavens remained; and the Earth substantively remained—overwhelmed indeed, but awaiting the retrogression

Digitized by Google

of the floods—destroyed as respects its previous *cosmical* condition, but itself continuing. It is only of its *cosmical* condition that the Apostle speaks: he carefully uses the word κοσμος. When, in Genesis ii., the creation of the Heavens and Earth in their associated perfectness is spoken of as finished, the words used are: "Thus the Heavens and the Earth were finished, and *all the host of them*," *i.e.*, all the things wherewith they were furnished and adorned. The expression chosen by the Septuagint translators, "the host of them," is, ὁ κοσμος αυτων—Vulgate, "*ornatus eorum.*"* It is evident, therefore, that to understand the word κοσμος, as used by the Apostle, in any other sense than this would be an utter perversion, not only of his statement, but of all that is stated in Genesis respecting the Flood and its effects upon the Earth. The Earth was not destroyed, except as respects that wherewith it was furnished and adorned. It appears somewhat strange to have to add that some who admit the distinction between κοσμος and γη, have, nevertheless, suggested that in using the word κοσμος the Apostle intended to speak of the created Universe as a whole:—a wondrously strange suggestion, for certainly the waters that overflowed the Earth produced no deluge in the Heavens. Were the Sun, and Moon, and Stars extinguished?

* See also Plin. H. N. 2, 3: Nam quem κοσμον, Græci nomine ornamenti, appellaverunt, cum nos a perfectâ absolutaque elegantiâ, *mundum*.

Digitized by Google

The Apostle's argument was directed against those who asserted that there had been no change in the condition of the Heavens and Earth since the Creation up to the then present hour. They rejected the history of the Flood; said that all things had continued as they were "from the beginning of the Creation,"* and so reasoning from the past to the future, denied that there would be any future change such as that of which the Prophets and the Apostles spoke. The Apostle argued that there had been at the Flood an intervention of the Lord by which the order of Earth, as it then was, had been obliterated, and that subsequently there would be another intervention whereby not merely the order, but the existence of the present Heavens and Earth will cease. There will be a visitation that shall change, and subsequently a dissolution that shall abolish. Both will take place "IN," and "BECAUSE OF," the Day of the Lord; ἐν ᾗ and δι' ἣν being the expressions used. The change will take place at the commencement, the abolition at the close, of the Millennial Day. The change at the beginning will prefigure, and be the earnest of, the dissolution at the close. Very great, therefore, will be the change. The Heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll (Isaiah xxxiv. 4), and the foundations of the Earth shall shake (Isaiah xxiv. 18); the Earth, to use the

* Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. These words show that the Apostle regarded the word "beginning" as indicating a point of time fixed and definite.

Digitized by Google

words of the Apostle Peter, "shall be searched out"—*εὑρεθησεται*. (2 Peter iii. 10.) "The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and shall be removed like a cottage"; that is, as regards all by which it is morally, socially, and governmentally characterised, "it shall fall, and not rise again." (See Isaiah xxiv. 20.) Yet great and terrible as the visitation will be, neither the Heavens nor the Earth will at that moment be destroyed. Physically they will continue. The work of destruction will be stayed, and for a thousand years Christ shall reign. "The moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients, gloriously." "Truth shall spring out of the earth; and righteousness shall look down from heaven." Such will be the *general* character of the Dispensation that will close the history of the Adamic Heavens and Earth. Afterward will come the New Heavens and the New Earth, established under the headship of and in congruity with the condition and unearthly glory of Him who is the SECOND MAN that is FROM HEAVEN. Great therefore is the contrast between the FIRST Heavens and FIRST Earth that shall pass away, and the New Heavens and New Earth that shall remain for ever. The *τα ψυχικα* will have passed: the *τα πνευματικα* will have come.

It is important, throughout the Scripture, to observe that Cities and Nations are sometimes spoken of in respect of

Digitized by Google

their *moral* characteristics and condition, and sometimes are regarded *physically*. Morally they may be abolished: physically they may remain. Take Tyre as an example. Viewed according to the moral characteristics which have hitherto marked her course, Tyre, in the next Dispensation, will be found no more. "When I shall set glory in the Land of the living [Immanuel's Land]: I will make thee [Tyre] a terror, and thou shalt be no more: though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found again, saith the Lord God." (Ez. xxvi. 20, 21. See also Ez. xxviii. 19.)

There is, however, a time yet to come when the "merchandise" and "hire" of Tyre (see Isaiah xxiii. 18) shall be "holiness unto the Lord." (See Psalm xlv. 12.) In the day of Jerusalem's glory "the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift." She shall be found among "the daughters of the famous nations" who shall own in that Day the supremacy of the City of God. See also Psalm lxxxvii. 4, which is also a Millennial Psalm. "Behold Philistia, and Tyre, with Ethiopia: this man was born there." Tyre, therefore, will be a place of honour—honoured in the sight of God. Physically, therefore, she shall re-exist; but as respects all that she hath been morally, she shall be known no more. Many other like examples might be given.

Digitized by Google

IV.—MEANING OF היה, *ΓΙΓΝΟΜΑΙ*.

ATTENTION to the meaning of היה is as needful as attention to the meaning of ברא, in order to understand aright the first verses of Genesis.

It seems to be well-nigh universally taken for granted that היה has a force coincident with that of *ειμι*, in Greek; and that, like *ειμι*, it is employed to express *the logical copula*, uniting the subject and predicate of a proposition. But this is a serious error. It is the habit of the Hebrew to suppress the copula. Gesenius rightly says: "The union of the substantive or pronoun which forms the subject of the sentence with another substantive or adjective as its predicate, is most commonly expressed by simply uniting them together without any copula." (Gesenius, Gr. § 141.) A thousand examples might be given. In our English version, when correctly printed, the omission is commonly denoted by printing "is," "was," or "shall be," in italics.

Genesis ix. 12. God said, This [is] the token.
„ xxi. 22. God [is] with thee.
„ xxvi. 24. I [am] the God of Abraham.
„ xxxi. 5, 50. God [is] witness.

1 Kings xviii. 39. They said, The Lord, he [is] the God: The Lord, he [is] the God.

1 Kings xx. 23. Their gods [are] gods of the hills.

Digitized by Google

Strangely, however, Gesenius gives two exceptions to this general (or I would rather say, universal) rule. His two examples, however, so far from being exceptions, may be quoted as strong proofs of its validity. One of these passages is Gen. iii. 1, "The serpent WAS [היה] more subtle than any beast of the field that the Lord God had made." No one can doubt that ערום is rightly translated *subtle* in this passage, for lying and deceit were the means whereby the serpent prevailed. Did God then create subtilty? It might be supposed so from this verse; and the supposition could scarcely be refuted if the verse, as usually given, were correctly translated. But the real statement is, "The serpent became to be [*εγενετο*—not *ην*] subtle, in distinction from [מ] every [other] beast of the field," &c. And how was this? Because Satan entered into it. *So* the serpent became subtle, and was brought into contrast with every other beast that the Lord had made. This is clearly expressed by the word היה, "*became*," but could not be expressed by the substantive verb "*was*." If "was" had been intended the Hebrew would have stood thus: הנחש ערום, "the serpent [was] subtle." In Hebrew there would have been no verb. This verse then strongly proves that היה is not to be rendered "*was*," but "*became*."

The other verse referred to by Gesenius as an exception is Genesis i. 2. That it is *not* an exception is proved by the many arguments that will be found in the earlier pages of this pamphlet. It is not

Digitized by Google

necessary to recapitulate them here. Commonly it has been supposed that the Earth having been in the first verse declared to be "created," is, in the second verse declared, when created, to have been chaotic ("formlessness and emptiness"); so that this clause is supposed to state, that the Earth when created WAS "emptiness"—the very thing that God in Isaiah declares it was not. This is sufficient to show that היתה is not consequential on ברא, and that it cannot be translated WAS. The Earth "*came into existence*" emptiness, but when pronounced "created," it was ordered and full of perfectness. There could not be a passage quoted in which it is more necessary to preserve the right meaning of היתה, *εγενετο*, than in this.

I have remarked that the use of היה in Hebrew corresponds very closely with the use of *γινομαι* in Greek; and the strict meaning of *γινομαι* is not "to be made" (*ποιεομαι*) nor "to be" (*ειμι*), but *to become*. In John i. 14, "The Word *became* flesh," is a much better translation than "the Word *was made* flesh." In Romans i. 3, there should be a like alteration, "concerning His Son *who became* of the seed of David according to the flesh," &c. Such a translation accords in both passages, and marks His assumption of humanity as voluntary. *Γινομαι* properly indicates the occurrence of new circumstances that existed not previously, as in the case where that which had no previous existence begins to exist; or, when that which has existed previously enters on

Digitized by Google

some new condition of being. In cases in which the new condition of being spoken of has been reached *by creation*, the general meaning may be sufficiently given by rendering γινγομαι, "*to be made*"; although even then the words, "*came into being*," or some such expression would more accurately represent the meaning—the object of γινγομαι being to direct the mind, not to the means or process by which the state spoken of is reached, whether by creation, or by birth, or in any other way; but to the fact of the attainment of existence in the state spoken of. Everyone would feel the impropriety of rendering Genesis i. 3, as given in LXX., by "Let there be light, and light was made," although it is quite true that light was made: but the mind is not directed in the last clause to the mode in which light was formed, but to the fact of light suddenly coming into existence out of a state of non-existence. Development or power of development, alteration of condition, or transition from one condition of being to another, is implied in γιγομαι. There may be cases in which it is impossible to preserve the specific meaning of words in a translation, and then we must be content to adopt some general expression; but we must always avoid giving a generic meaning where the specific can not only be used, but where it is more appropriate. In almost every instance, the difference between ειναι, *to be*; ὑπαρχειν, *to subsist or to have a known and developed existence*; γινγεσθαι, *to become—hence, to come into existence, to come to pass*; κτιζεσθαι,

to be created, and ποιεισθαι, *to be made*, can be preserved.

These remarks respecting *γινγομαι* may, for the most part, be applied to היה. Like *γινγομαι*, היה has always associated with it the thought of "existence" or "being," but it also implies development, or power of development and of action. In many cases the scope of the meaning of היה is recognised in our Version :—

Gen. xv. 1. The word of the Lord *came* (היה) unto Abram.

Josh. xxii. 20. Wrath fell (היה) on all the congregation.

2 Sam. vii. 24. Thou, Lord, art become (היה) their God.

1 Sam. iv. 9. Be strong and quit yourselves (הוה) like men.

I know of no passage in which the force of its meaning is not weakened by translating היה as if it were synonymous with *ειμι*. "Moses kept the flock of Jethro," &c., is not the same statement as, Moses became keeper of the flock of Jethro—היה לרעה. (Ex. iii. 1.)

הוה and יש are words which, far more nearly than היה, resemble *ειμι*. The latter, however, יש, resembles *ὑπαρχω* far more nearly than it does *ειμι*. See remarks on *ὑπαρχω* that follow. The former הוה or הוא is often used in Chaldee as an auxiliary verb, and sometimes as the copula (see

Digitized by Google

Ezra v. 5), "The eye of their God *was* upon the Elders."

It will, probably, be said that the Septuagint translators, being well acquainted with Hebrew and with Greek, cannot be supposed to be chargeable with erroneous translation in adopting *ειμι*, as they often have done, as their rendering of היה. We may reply that our English translators, although well acquainted both with their own language and with Greek, have nevertheless frequently rendered *γινγομαι*, as if it had been *ειμι*, or *ποιεω*. Translation may be imperfect or inexact when it is not absolutely false. All who have been engaged in translating well know that the temptation to use wide and general terms, instead of those that are specific, is often very great. The general statement may not be false, but it lacks the accuracy and precision of the more specific. Vagueness is sometimes deemed safer than precision.

NOTE.

Between the Greek words *ειναι* and *ὑπαρχειν*, there is a considerable resemblance of meaning. The former is used when the attention is directed either to abstract independent existence, or to the fact of existence, rather than to the circumstances connected with that existence. The latter (*ὑπαρχω*) is used when not the existence merely, but the *subsistence, i.e.*, the circumstances under which the existence is held, is made the subject of regard. Thus, when it is said, "Before

Abraham was I AM;" or "The Son *ὁ ων* (the Being One) in the bosom of the Father," the chief thought is abstract essential existence; and accordingly *ειμι* is used. But when it is said, "who being (*ὑπαρχων*—subsisting) in the form of God, thought it not robbery," &c., the attention is especially directed to the circumstances connected with the existence spoken of, and that in contrast with other circumstances about to be entered into. Again, when the circumstances are manifest, palpable, or recognised by the persons addressed, *ὑπαρχω* is used. Thus St. Paul, addressing St. Peter, says, *Ει συ Ιουδαιος ὑπαρχων.* The fact of Peter's being a Jew was patent to all who heard Paul speak. It was a known and undisputed fact. But when the fact of St. Paul's condition was doubted, he says, "Men and brethren, I am (*ειμι*) a Pharisee." (Acts xxiii. 6.) "I am (*ειμι*) a man which am a Jew." (Acts xxi. 39.) As a general rule it may be said, that when instruction is given respecting anything that is new, or disputed, or respecting which the persons addressed are supposed to be ignorant, *ειμι* is used; but when the reverse is the case, *ὑπαρχω* is employed. In almost every case in which *ὑπαρχω* is used in the New Testament, the words "avowedly," or "confessedly," or "plainly," or "palpably," might be added as explanatory.

See also the use of *ὑπαρχω* in such passages as the following: *ὑπαρχουσα ουσια*: *τουτων δ' ὑπαρχοντων*—His positis et constitutis: *πολλοις ὑπαρχει των ζωων*, such "common properties" being not only existent, but having a displayed and recognised existence.

WERTHEIMER, LEA & Co., Printers, Circus Place, London Wall.

Digitized by Google

THEOLOGICAL OPINIONS

OF

Rev. Joseph Cook,

OF BOSTON,

BRIEFLY CONSIDERED.

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON:

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,
12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, LONDON, E.C 1.

1881.

Digitized by Google

LONDON
WERTHEIMER, LEA & CO., PRINTERS,
CIRCUS PLACE, LONDON WALL.
Digitized by Google

Introduction.

WITH great reluctance I have written the pamphlet which I now publish.

A friend in London, having some months ago sent me one of Mr. Cook's volumes, asked me to express my opinion of the doctrines contained in it. I was previously unacquainted with his writings; but I had scarcely opened the book when I discerned its general tendency, and returned a somewhat hasty reply. My letter will be found in the Appendix.

This letter, having been shown to many, was read by the Editor of "The Christian," who forwarded it to Mr. Cook. Mr. Cook, in a private letter to the Editor, commented on it somewhat severely. This letter, of which I retain a copy, I will, if I can obtain Mr. Cook's permission, publish in the Appendix.

A reply to Mr. Cook's remarks being thus rendered necessary, I prefer that my answer should be public.

In this pamphlet I have not confined myself to the subject of my letter. The question is a much

Digitized by Google

wider one. It affects the revealed doctrines of Christianity generally.

In the first two chapters I have touched briefly on the doctrine of the Alexandrine Pantheists. I do not accuse Mr. Cook of belonging, like Maurice and Kingsley, to that school; but he makes no stand against it, and he has in some cases made statements that even Maurice and Kingsley would, as I believe, have hesitated to endorse. I doubt whether they would have ventured to use the language he has used on pages 50 and 51 of "Orthodoxy," respecting "conscience."

Being convinced that the effect of Mr. Cook's teaching would be to bridge over the gulf which separates Revealed Truth from Neologianism, and having observed the dangerous ignorance that prevails respecting the character of that system, I have in the first two chapters given a brief and imperfect sketch of its doctrines.*

To the third chapter, I would invite special

* The first two chapters consist chiefly of extracts from the valuable work of Dr. Rigg on "Modern Anglican Theology," published by Alexander Heylin, 28, Paternoster Row, and from an able review of that work, which, after having first appeared in "The Record" newspaper, was afterwards published by Seeley in a separate form. It is now, I regret to say, out of print. I applied at Seeley's, but was unable to procure a copy. Dr. Rigg's work may be obtained still. I fear that neither of these works have received the attention they deserve. No subject can be more solemnly important; yet there is none perhaps that is more shunned.

Digitized by Google

attention. No question can be more solemnly important than that which concerns God's estimate of our natural condition as lost sinners. I regard the statements of Mr. Cook, as found in the extracts that I have given in the third chapter, to be irreconcilably at variance with the Word of God.

The subject of the fourth chapter is equally important. The *sole* authority of the written Word is, by the extracts quoted in that chapter, set aside. We are required to recognise four Testaments instead of two. Conscience is exalted into a divine place. The same "map" by which its condition and Carlyle's condition are pourtrayed, is deemed meet to delineate Holy Scripture too. (See end of Chapter IV.)

In the fifth Chapter the question touched on in my letter above referred to, is considered. I still maintain that if the word "punish" as applied to Christ be abandoned *on the ground put forward by writers of the New England School*, the doctrine of Atonement as taught in the Scripture is repudiated. I cannot accept Mr. Cook's definition of Atonement.

The subsequent Chapters will speak for themselves. In one, I have endeavoured to give briefly a sketch of the doctrine of the Atonement as taught in the Scriptures. In another, will be found some remarks on that often perverted passage in the ninth verse of the first Chapter of the Gospel of John. The doctrine that Christ is IN every man

Digitized by Google

that is born into the world, is one which, *if consistently held*, must lead to Deism or Pantheism. Christ cannot be IN those who are dead in sins.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body *as taught in Scripture* Mr. Cook denies. We must cancel 1 Cor. xv. if we accept his statements.

I read in the Scripture that God CREATED all things, and that He created them μη ἐκ των φαινομενων, "*not of things that appear*"—in other words, that He created them out of nothing. I find Mr. Cook saying, "I suppose, Almighty God evolves the seen universe of matter and the unseen of finite force from Himself. It is not my belief that everything was created from nothing." (Lecture 3rd Series, p. 57.)

Notwithstanding that these and like sentiments abound in Mr. Cook's writings, one of our most widely circulated religious papers shrinks not from the responsibility of thus commending them:—

"Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have issued in a cheap and popular form three volumes of Mr. Joseph Cook's *Boston Monday Lectures*—"Biology," "Transcendentalism," and "Orthodoxy" (1s. 6d. each), author's English edition. Surely in all the republic of letters there could nowhere be found so much high and correct thinking at such a trifling cost, on the supremest subjects that can occupy the human heart and mind, as in these beautifully printed volumes. Although some o the topics are abstruse to the unscientific student, he will be fascinated by Mr. Cook's clear merciless logic, his wealth of illustration, and his singularly original and expressive phraseology. In the volume entitled "Orthodoxy," there is a note

Digitized by Google

appended relating to the lecture on the Atonement, with the view of removing some misconceptions that have arisen since Mr. Cook's arrival in this country, as to his teaching on this all-important subject. Every thoughtful young man, and woman too, who does not possess these lectures should avail themselves of the present opportunity."

And now I must appeal to the President and to the other authorities of the Young Men's Christian Association in London, whether after they shall have read the extracts given in this Pamphlet, they can in consistency with their allegiance to Holy Scripture and to God, sanction the doctrines which are in those extracts taught, and aid in their promulgation.

If they should answer in the affirmative, I should regard it as one of the most alarming, if not the most alarming, of the many threatening signs of this present fearful hour.

I have said that Mr. Cook makes no stand against Pantheism: I might have expressed myself more strongly. Mr. Cook says:—

"Pantheism, however, with immeasurably narrow horizons, asserts that natural law and God are one; and thus, at its best, it teaches but one-half the truth; namely, the Divine Immanency, and not the Divine Transcendency. Christian Theism, in the name of the scientific method, teaches both. . . . . Scientific Theism supposes that the whole universe, or finite existence in its widest range, is filled by the infinite Omnipresent Will, as the bow is filled with light; and this in such a sense that we may say that natural law is God, who was, who is, and who is to come. In the incontrovertible

Digitized by Google

scientific certainty of the Divine Immanency, we may feel ourselves transfigured as truly as any poetic pantheist ever felt himself to be when lifted to his highest possible mount of vision." ("Biology," p. 128.)

Mr. Cook, of course, could not be expected to denounce that which is to be blamed only for what it lacks. He thinks Pantheism, at its best, may teach "one half the truth." It must be supposed, therefore, to err, because of that which it omits, not because of that which it affirms. No unimportant admission this! Mr. Cook apparently wishes to add to Pantheism the half-truth it lacks, and to introduce to us a corrected Pantheism arrayed in the garb of Orthodoxy. The Pantheistic half, and the added half, will both be rejected by those who take Scripture only as their guide.

Digitized by Google

Postscript.

SINCE the greater part of this pamphlet was written, a new edition of Mr. Cook's book has been published, containing the explanatory notice, referred to in the extract from "The Christian" above given.

Mr. Cook's assurance that his views of the Atonement are "common to standard evangelical authorities," and the summary of his faith subsequently given, would readily be accepted if he had written no books, or if his books had been withdrawn. But whilst those books are in circulation we cannot but take them as the test whereby his opinions must be tried. We know from sorrowful experience that the words both of Scripture and of Creeds may be used by different individuals in widely different meanings. Words used in definitions may need to be themselves defined. His definition of Atonement, as given in his book, is certainly not one which would be accepted by those whom we have been accustomed to consider "standard authorities." Dr. Hodge, for example, would not accept it.

Digitized by Google

But Mr. Cook's books are not confined to the subject of the Atonement. They are wide in their scope: and many principles of vast importance, for good or for evil, are put forward in them. The extracts given in this pamphlet will speak for themselves. If the statements of those extracts be true, I am certainly altogether blinded as regards the meaning of Holy Scripture. I ask that they should be solemnly read and compared with the Word of God.

The following extract refers to the New Birth :—

"George Whitfield, in this house, one hundred and forty years ago, taught the doctrine of the New Birth, at an hour when it was a novelty in New England. A Church, more or less connected with the State, had become so secularized, even in Boston, as not to require a spiritual Church membership. So deeply did Whitfield and Edwards sink a belief in the necessity of the New Birth into the minds of this country, that to-day the doctrine is common-place. We read Whitfield's discourses, and wonder what in them could have awakened such attention as to pack thousands into this house, and bring together fifteen, eighteen, twenty thousand in the hushed, open-air assemblies on Boston Common. The doctrine which he taught he supported by Revelation. Discussing the relations of religion to science, *I am to establish the same doctrine with no aid from Scripture at all, except in so far as the human soul is a revelation from God, and as natural law enswathing us is itself a Divine Scripture, as sacred as any other penned by the Almighty finger.* What I am afraid of is, not the ban of an ecclesiastical party, for I belong to no party; but it is dissonance with the nature of things. It is want of harmony with that constitution of the universe which was, and is, and

Digitized by Google

is to come. It is unalterable, and it is He. Is it literally true that the New Birth, defined as Edwards and Whitfield understood it, must be sought by culture, if culture is to be true to its own principles? What is the New Birth? The acquisition of similarity of feeling with God. . . . . It has already been shewn that fellowship with God in nature requires fellowship with the highest outcome of nature,—that is, with the law of the ascent of life, or with the conscience as the highest in man, and with the Christ, as the highest in history.

"But this fellowship of affection with the Christ and with conscience is only another name for the New Birth, and therefore the necessity of the latter results from a thorough application of the first principle of culture. . . . . The second principle of culture requires freedom and full growth for all the faculties, including conscience; and this, at its fullest development, is to be seen only in the Christ. And so the second principle necessitates the glad and total surrender of the will to the moral law, and this is but another name for the New Birth. . . . . What the plan of human nature requires is seen in the highest outcome of the law of the ascent of life—that is, in the conscience in man, and in the Christ in history. . . . . The soul, therefore, under the central principle of culture, must be harmonized with the conscience at its best, that is, with the Christ, and this is only another name for the New Birth." (Fifth Series, pp. 61, 62, 63.)

This extract, taken by itself, is sufficiently fearful. But when we remember that the "culture" spoken of is to be sought under the guidance not of the written Word of God *merely*, but of two other unwritten Testaments, and that his four tests of truth are "Intuition, Instinct, Experiment in the large range, and Syllogism;" that conscience is defined to be "that divine Somewhat or Some One who is

Digitized by Google

revealed by the moral law, and is in us, but not of us," and that it may be worshipped; when we connect these statements with the sentiments advanced in the extract just given, we shall see that these books not only present to us as true certain things that are not true, but that they propose to us also a new way of attaining Truth—a way of which I confidently say, that God is not in it.

I wish it to be distinctly understood that my remarks in this pamphlet refer exclusively to the *published* statements of Mr. Cook, as found in the extracts that will be given. I maintain that these statements are at utter variance with the teaching of Holy Scripture. They show too plainly the lamentable results of following the guidance of two unwritten "Testaments" (as Mr. Cook calls them) rather than the guidance of God's Word written.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER I.

ALEXANDRINE PANTHEISM.

OF all the periods of Christendom's sorrowful history, there is none, perhaps, more disastrous in its consequences than the era of the Alexandrine Schools in the third century.

Egypt has ever held a fearful place in the world's history. There primæval Truth was early corrupted. The mythology, which Greece afterwards accepted and disseminated, found its birthplace in Egypt. Egypt was one of the chief corrupters of Israel. There, too, in the Schools of Alexandria, was cherished that mental lawlessness (*ἀνομια*) from which Society in England is at this moment receiving one of its chief impulses.

In the Alexandrine Schools there were manifold varieties of thought. Pagan and semi-Pagan, Jewish and semi-Jewish, Christian and semi-Christian systems of Philosophy all caused their voices to be heard; and the result was a strife of tongues, amidst the confusion of which the voice of Christ's pure Truth could no more be heard, than could the wail of an infant amid the fury of a desolating storm. Mohammedanism in the East, and Popery in the West, came as the scourge of Heaven upon

Digitized by Google

the arrogancy of philosophic truthlessness that exalted itself against God. Those two mighty agencies controlled for centuries the energies of the world, and delivered men over to ignorance and vice, in order that they might be the more easily governed. Men ceased to think, or to act, except as others bade them.

At last the Protestant Reformation, through God's great mercy, came. It brought back light, *for it brought the Scriptures*, which in Western Europe were searched and read and taught in a manner in which they had never been since the Apostles died. Protestantism for a time rejoiced in that light. It might have advanced and known something of that liberty wherewith "the Truth (and the Truth only) maketh free." But declension came in. In those countries especially, where the light of Protestantism first shone, darkness is settling down. Some are seeking refuge in Rome: others have gone to Alexandria. The Neology, as it is called, of Germany and England, is nothing more than revived Alexandrine Truthlessness. There ever must be Truthlessness where God's Word is dishonoured and eschewed. Of all the threatening dangers that now surround us, there is none more to be dreaded than the revival of Alexandrianism. Protestantism came from God to free men from slavery and debasement, and to bring them through the Scriptures into the liberty of Truth. Alexandrianism, under the name of

Digitized by Google

Neology, has come to bring into the liberty of self-will. Our thoughts are our own: our tongue is our own, who is lord over us? Discord there must be; concord there cannot be, where men find in their own verifying faculty or self-consciousness the guide of their way. There can be no unity, where there is not child-like submission to God's Word written.

At a moment, therefore, like the present, when Error is advancing around us with giant strides, it becomes the defenders of Evangelical Truth to be very careful not to accredit as public teachers any who are not *avowedly hostile* both to Romanism and to Neology in all their forms. There should not be undue suspicion, but there should be caution. The Rev. Joseph Cook, from America, has recently come to this country, and we are asked to receive his teaching. Our estimate of that teaching should be formed not merely from the opinion of others, or from conversations with himself. It should be formed from his writings—his own accredited writings—writings which he himself presents to us as the deliberate record of his sentiments. His book on "Orthodoxy" is being widely circulated. On that we should form our judgment. Does that book give a plain, outspoken testimony against Neology, or does he so speak of leading Neologian writers as to leave on our minds the impression that he would consent to number them among the Defenders of Christian truth? Are

Digitized by Google

they, or are they not to be regarded as witnesses to the Truth of God? Though the teachers of the Neologian School differ often in their statements or modes of statement, yet they all agree in depreciating the Bible, in accepting an "inward light" or "inner consciousness," or "a verifying faculty," as their guide, and in rejecting, or else giving new and non-natural meanings to the theological terms commonly used by orthodox Christians. For the present enquiry, Maurice, Kingsley and Stanley are the writers with whom we are principally concerned.

The character of Dean Stanley is sketched by Dr. Pusey in the passage I am about to cite. It is sketched with great (shall I say, too great?) leniency of expression and sentiment. I quote it partly because of its lucidity and conciseness, and partly because no one will suppose Dr. Pusey to be influenced by evangelical bias. The passage is as follows.

"It seems to be almost a principle with Dean Stanley, to hold *that* to be uncertain which is assailed. Conviction, amid contradictions of truth, seems to him undue dogmatism. His mind has been remarkably characterised as one which, 'having a poetical faculty of seeing resemblances, lacks the philosophical power of seeing differences.' In his Lectures on the Jewish Church, worthless heathen or Jewish tradition (some of it entitled Mohammedan, as drawn by Mohammed from his apostate

Digitized by Google

Jewish teacher) is mixed up with Scripture truth wherever it adds a poetic feature to the history. But the impression is given, that most is alike tradition; of which some being patently absurd and untrue, an atmosphere of haze is thrown over the whole. Hints are given, as occasion suggests, of the uncertainty of the date of this or that portion of prophecy against which German Rationalism has declared, as if it were of no account. He does not seem to be conscious what he is parting with. He speaks, *e.g.* of 'innocent questions about the date of the book of Daniel' ("Jewish Church," p. 467; comp. p. 423), when the question is, 'Is that book Divine, or human claiming to be Divine?' One who teaches on these subjects, ought to have made up his mind upon them. And so, of course, would Dean Stanley, had he thought it of any account. Meanwhile, truth and doubt are mixed up together; and to censure denial of truth, is to secure his sympathy with the denial. The truth of the Old Testament history in its details is apparently presupposed throughout his work; at the close (p. 521) Dr. Colenso's attacks on the Pentateuch are endorsed, and we are told to reckon the 'errors and defects of the Old Testament' 'amongst its safeguards.' (P. 522.) The same habit of indefiniteness extends to doctrine also, even as to the doctrine of the Atonement. Indeed, he seems unable to grasp or to state any doctrine definitely." (Preface to "Lectures on the Book of Daniel.")

Digitized by Google

A short time ago, the Lectures of Dr. Stanley on the Jewish Church, were ably reviewed in "The Record." The following propositions give the result of the analysis to which the Dean's Lectures were subjected :—

"I. That there is no supernatural or Divine element in the Old Testament Scriptures.

"II. That whatever permanent truth there is in their teaching is not peculiar or original to the Hebrew prophets, but is either an embodiment of the moral wants of human nature, or a plagiarism from Greek philosophy.

"III. That the Canonical and Apocryphal books stand on precisely the same footing of authority and credibility.

"IV. That in neither the one nor the other was there any inspiration possessed, beyond that ordinary action of the Spirit on the minds of men, to which all that is great and true is to be attributed.

"V. That no promise of a Divine person, who should offer a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world, is included in the sense of the prophetical books, or can properly be gathered from their language.

"VI. That the Lord Jesus Christ was the greatest of all prophets, but that He only bore the sins of men in the sense of fulfilling that universal moral law of human life by

Digitized by Google

which one suffers for another, and which has its constant accomplishment in the common relationships of man with man."

Such are the lenient criticisms of Dr. Pusey and of "The Record" on Dr. Stanley. Let us now see what Mr. Cook's judgment is. His words are these :—

"Dean Stanley as a theologian is far less broad than Dean Stanley as an ecclesiastical politician. . . . . Dean Stanley is by no means careless in his statements as to the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Atonement. He holds such views as Charles Kingsley did; and what Kingsley's views of the Trinity were, I showed to you in detail the other morning. No doubt Charles Kingsley held erratic views on one or two points; but *he was substantially sound on what the Church of England regards as the essentials of Christian truth, and so surely Stanley is,** or he would not be where he is. . . . . He is to be ranked with Kingsley and Robertson and Milman as a follower of Hooker, and an opponent of the influences of Laud."—(Cook's "Orthodoxy," p. 174.)

One is tempted to ask, in reading such a statement as this, whether or not Mr. Cook has ever read the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England. That he has read the writings of the leaders of the Neologian School is evident enough from the book before us. So far from these writers being "substantially sound on what the Church of England regards as the essentials of Christian truth," nothing can be further from the fact. Their views touching the Inspiration of Scripture, Justification through faith, Atonement, etc., etc., differ

* The italics are mine.

Digitized by Google

toto cælo from those of the Articles and Homilies; nothing can be more complete than the opposition. Dean Stanley altogether rejects the doctrine of vicarious atonement by blood-shedding, and so did Maurice, Kingsley's master. Kingsley himself says of the "form of Christianity" which he approves, that he may tell all he knows about it, "*almost without mentioning a single doctrine which now influences the Christian world.*" The theology of this School is avowedly a *supplanting* theology. They wish to introduce a *new* Creed, and to give to old terms *new* senses. They would bring us far nearer to Philo than to St. Paul. Indeed Kingsley does not hesitate to say that St. Paul was "*a practised Platonic Dialectician.*"* As to the Gospel and Epistles of St. John he writes thus :—

"One can hardly doubt, I should fancy, that many parts of St. John's Gospel and Epistles, whatever view we may take of them, if they are to be called anything are to be called metaphysic and philosophic. And one can no more doubt that before writing them he had studied Philo, and was expanding Philo's thought in the direction which seemed fit to him, than we can doubt it of the earlier Neo-Platonists."†

These two passages can scarcely be read without a shudder. They do despite to the Spirit of God.

Nothing can be more opposed to the doctrines of the Articles and Homilies than the writings of

* See Dr. Rigg's "Modern Anglican Theology," p. 231.

† *Ibid.*, p. 233.

Digitized by Google

these men. The Reformers would no more have tolerated them than they would have tolerated Servetus. As to Hooker, he would have shuddered at their presence, and would have shrunk from their doctrines as from vipers. Mr. Cook has formed a strange misjudgment of facts here. The difference between the doctrines taught in the Homilies and Articles of the Church of England and those of the Neologian School are so vast, so terrible, that Eternity only will disclose its awfulness. Are we to ignore or hide this difference?

The Eleventh Article of the Church of England is:—

"We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit (propter meritum) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith (per fidem) and not for (propter) our own works and deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

Such is the doctrine of the Church of England. One of Dr. Stanley's latest utterances is,

"The formula of Justification by faith, on which, with other points of narrow doctrine, John Wesley rang the changes, is doomed to perish."—(Dean Stanley's sermon on the occasion of the death of Thomas Carlyle. Feb. 6th, 1881.)

Yet Dr. Stanley is pronounced by Mr. Cook to be "substantially sound on what the Church of England regards as the essentials of Christian Truth."

The following is an extract from a sermon preached

Digitized by Google

by Dean Stanley before the University of Oxford, June, 1875.

"But looking to the Bible only, we cannot go far wrong in adopting the only definition of the blood of Christ which has come down to us from primitive times. It is contained in one of the three undisputed epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. 'The blood of Christ,' he said, 'is love or charity.' With this unquestionably agrees the language of the New Testament. Love, unselfish love, is there spoken of, again and again, as the essence of the highest life of God and of the highest life of man, and therefore as the essence of the life and death of Christ. *It is this love, stronger than death—this love manifesting itself in death—willing to spend itself for others, that is the blood of the cross, in which God is well pleased. Not the pain or torture of the cross—for that was alike odious to God and useless to man**—but the love, the self-devotion, the generosity, the magnanimity, the forgiveness, the toleration, the compassion of which that blood was the expression and of which that life and death were the fulfilment. 'Non sanguine, sed pietate placatur Deus'† is the true maxim of more than one of the Fathers. 'What is the atonement of Christ?' asked Livingstone of his own solitary soul in the last months of his African wanderings. And he answered, 'It is Himself—it is the inherent and everlasting mercy of God made apparent to human eyes and ears. The everlasting love was disclosed by our Lord's life and death. It showed that God forgives because He loves to forgive. He rules, if possible, by smiles and not by frowns. Pain is only a means of enforcing love.' This, then, is the true life-blood of human society, more precious than any drops brought by pilgrim or crusader in crystal vials to golden shrines. This is the true Sangreal which the chivalry of our

* The italics are mine.

† "Not by blood, but by piety God is propitiated."

Digitized by Google

modern age must seek and find—the charity of God to man, the charity of men to one another, with all its endless sequences. If it be not this, what is it? If there be any other characteristic of Christ more essential to His true nature, if there be any other message of the gospel more precious than this, let us know it. But till we are told of any other, we may rest contented with the definition of the second century, that it is that which St. John himself describes as the essence of the nature of God—'God is Love'—which St. Paul describes as the highest of the virtues of man—'the greatest of these is Love.' . . . . .

"When the Prophet said that our sins should be made as white as snow, he meant that so great is the power of the human will, so great is the power of the grace of God, that the human character can be transformed—that the soul which once was stained deep with the red spots of sin can become literally white as driven snow. When we speak of Christ Himself as the spotless, immaculate Lamb, we mean that He was really without spot of sin. When we speak of ourselves as washed in the blood of that Lamb, we mean that our uncharitableness, our untruthfulness, our cowardice, our vulgarity, our unfairness, are washed out, and that so far as human infirmity will permit, we are made like Him. When some one said of Sir Isaac Newton that his was the whitest soul he ever knew, it was meant literally that his was a soul of stainless honour, spotless integrity, and crystal purity."

Such is the doctrine of Dean Stanley respecting the blood of the Cross, and yet Mr. Cook says, "Dean Stanley is by no means careless in his statements as to the doctrines of the Trinity, and of the Atonement." He pronounces him to be "substantially sound on what the Church of England regards as the essentials of Christian truth." ("Orthodoxy," p. 174.)

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II.

ALEXANDRINE PANTHEISM—(*Continued*).

AFTER what has been already said it may seem unnecessary to refer further to the views of Maurice and Kingsley. I associate their names because, as Dr. Rigg truly observes, they are "commonly, and justly coupled together. Their philosophy is one. We do not know one particular in which they disagree." Now there are certain things which it is utterly impossible that any one who is savingly acquainted with revealed truth could either think or say. No real Christian could imagine that the Apostle Paul was "a Platonic dialectician," or that John was "a metaphysician and had studied Philo." If the light of Christ's truth had even dawned on Kingsley's soul, he would have judged such thoughts as these to be little short of blasphemy. No further evidence then as to the character of his and Maurice's doctrine is *necessary*. Nevertheless, as some minds are not satisfied except by superfluity of evidence, I will treat this part of the subject a little more fully.

It is impossible in the present pamphlet to give a full view of Maurice's system. Alexandrine Platonism, not Scripture, guides his thoughts. He

Digitized by Google

believes in the creation of abstract ideas or forms anterior to the creation of individual things. The creation of Adam in the first chapter of Genesis is not the same as his subsequent creation in the second chapter. He regarded not only the creation of man, but also "the creation of beasts, and birds, and fishes," which is recorded in the previous chapter (Gen. i.), "as the bringing forth of kinds and orders, such as they were according to the mind of God, not of actual separate phenomenal existences, such as they present themselves to the senses of man." (See Maurice "On Old Testament," p. 6.) He teaches that the days and the week spoken of in Gen. i. and ii. refer not to real, but ideal time; that is, as he himself explains it to be, no time at all. This whole ideal creation is lifted out of the sphere of actual events into that region which is above time, or change, or succession. In other words, this ideal creation took place in eternity!! (See Dr. Rigg, p. 131.)

Following out this thought after the manner of the Neo-Platonists, who believed in a Triad or Trinity of Divine hypostases, Maurice maintained that all things were created in the Son before the world was.

"I ask you," he says, "not to believe that a man was able to frustrate the purposes of God, not to think that the world was created in Adam, or stood in his obedience, when the Scriptures of the New Testament, illustrating those of

Digitized by Google

the Old, teach us that it stood and stands in the obedience of God's well-beloved Son, the real image of the Father, *the real bond of human society, and of the whole universe*, who was to be manifested in the fulness of time, *as that which He had always been*, namely, the original and archetype of human nature."—("On the Old Testament," pp. 40, 41.)

In the Son of God "all things had stood from the first;" in Him "God had looked upon His creature man from the first."—("Unity of the New Testament," p. 367.)

"How impossible was it then for him (St. Paul) to receive baptism as if it were merely the outward badge of a profession, a sign which separated the sect of the Nazarenes from other Jews or other men! If it marked him out as a Christian, that was because it denoted that he would no more be the member of any sect, of any partial society whatever: that he was claiming his relation to the Son of God, *the Head of the whole human race*. It must import his belief that this Son of God, and not Adam, was the true root of humanity; that from Him, and not from any ancestor, each man derived his life."—("Essays," pp. 201, 202.)

The philosophic Neology of Kingsley (for it is not the theology of the Bible), though having in it more of "heart" and philanthropic sentiment, was identical with that of Maurice, as the following quotations show. The basis of thought is the same. A cup of poison does not become the less dangerous by being sweetened.

"The Logos, the Divine Teacher in whom both Christians and heathens believed, was the very archetype of men; and He had proved that fact by being made flesh, and dwelling bodily among them, that they might behold His glory, full of grace and truth, and see that it was at once

Digitized by Google

the perfection of man and the perfection of God; that that which was most Divine was most human, and that which was most human, most Divine. That was the outcome of *their* metaphysic, that they had found the Absolute One; because One existed in whom the apparent antagonism between that which is eternally, and that which becomes in time, between the ideal and the actual, between the spiritual and the material, in a word, between God and man, was explained and reconciled for ever." ("Alexandria and her Schools," p. 123.)

The following quotation is taken from a foreign writer (Ruysbroek). Mr. Kingsley speaks of it as "containing the very key-note and central idea of mysticism." He characterises it as "essentially true," and "inexpressibly important," so that "twenty pages of comment upon it would not have been mis-devoted."

"I believe that the Son is the image of the Father; that in the Son have dwelt from all eternity, foreknown and contemplated by the Father, the prototypes of all mankind. We existed in the Son before we were born. He is the creative ground of all creatures—the eternal cause and principle of their life. The highest essence of our being rests, therefore, in God—exists in His image in the Son."

"As I believe, one common Logos, Word, Reason, reveals and unveils the same eternal truth to all who seek and hunger for it. Therefore we can, as the Christian philosophers of Alexandria did, rejoice over every truth which their heathen adversaries beheld, and attribute them, as Clement does, to the highest source, to the inspiration of the one and universal Logos." ("Alexandria," pp. 98, 99.)

"The universal soul thrills through the whole creation

Digitized by Google

doing the behests of that Reason" [Logos] "from which it overflowed . . . . . warring with the brute forces of gross matter, crushing all which is foul and dissonant to itself, and clasping to its bosom the beautiful, and all wherein it discovers its own reflex; impressing on it its signature, reproducing from it its own likeness, whether star, demon, or soul of the elect." ("Hypatia," Vol. I., p. 187.)

His view of the inspiration of the Prophets may be gained from the following passage. The Scripture says that "they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But Mr. Kingsley thinks otherwise. He says:—

"*Prophetes* means, not a foreteller, but an out-teller, . . . and he became a foreteller, among heathens, at least, *as I consider, among all peoples whatever*, because, knowing the real bearing of what had happened, and what was happening, he could discern the signs of the times, and so had what the world calls a shrewd guess—what I, like a pantheist as I am denominated, should call a Divine and inspired foresight—of what was going to happen." ("Yeast," p. 295.)

A great deal more might be added, but I wish not to increase the size of this pamphlet. They who know and cleave to the Scripture will not require further proof of the character of this fearful system, which defies the authority of the Word of God, and deifies philosophic thought. It may truly be said of this school, that not one of the characteristic truths of Christianity is held by them except in name. The Scripture

Digitized by Google

doctrine respecting the Creation, the Fall, Sin, the Incarnation, Christ's Suretyship, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Judgment, and the Second Death, are all either perverted or rejected. The sacrifices ordained by God under the Law did not (according to Mr. Maurice) embody the principle of expiatory atonement, but taught the principle and duty of self-sacrifice.* Mr. Maurice elevates Socrates and Plato—if not Mahomet also (see his "Religions of the World")—to the rank of Prophets, though perhaps not so greatly and uniformly inspired. (See "The Record's Review of Modern Anglican Neology," page 94.) Men now no longer need regeneration, for they were created in the Son in Eternity, and when the Son became incarnate, all men were regenerated. (See Review, p. 80.) The doctrine of the Trinity is held only in name, for to say that all men were created in the Son, connects the Son with humanity before His incarnation, and therefore ascribes to the Son in eternity a condition of being, different from that which He had in eternity as God—one with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Anxious to avoid Tritheism they use illustrations and expressions that tend to take from the Divine Persons their proper individuality,

* See Rigg, page 345. The more advanced disciples of this school sneer at the Old Testament doctrines as "Hebrew old clothes," and "the religion of the shambles." The first of these expressions is Carlyle's.

Digitized by Google

and go near, if not into, Sabellianism, deluding themselves with the vain thought that they can make that plain to reason which God has not made plain to reason. We believe all that God has revealed, not because we understand all that He has revealed, but because we understand that God has revealed it. Man can never find certainty save in submission to authority—the authority of God's Word written.

"It will at once be seen" (I quote from Dr. Rigg) "that the principle which we have been endeavouring to exhibit, overturns the whole of Christian "theology from its foundations. God the Father is "no longer regarded, in any proper sense, as the "Creator of man, and the Moral Governor of a world "of subject and guilty creatures. He is *merely* the "Father of all men in Christ the Son. Mankind are "His sons, not by adoption or by grace, but by "nature. Their sonship, too, can never be disannulled or done away. They can never be, for a "moment, separated from the Son. Their being is "*of* Him and *in* Him, and in Mr. Maurice's scheme, "can neither be, nor be conceived of, apart from "Him. This, as we shall see by-and-bye, is the "uniform doctrine of the 'Essays.' Being thus "necessarily and essentially one with the Son, and "in Him united to the Father, no atonement, in "the proper sense of that word, can be needed to "bring nigh those who never can be far off; and "no judicial condemnation can be pronounced on

Digitized by Google

" those who must ever be identified with the " Son."

" The Son of God, on this scheme, is the Mediator " between God and man, not in virtue of the cove- " nant of grace, not because man's fall had ren- " dered a Redeemer necessary, but from eternity, " and in virtue of what may be called His natural " relationship to both God and man. The Incar- " nation is not the ground of Christ's mediatorial " exaltation, but merely a consequence and particular " manifestation of that natural and aboriginal rela- " tionship. By His Incarnation the Son of God " did but manifest that identity which had ever " subsisted between Himself and man, exhibit the " ideal perfection of man's nature in His own " person, and, by His example, show to all men " how they should triumph over selfishness and " evil. As the mediatorial reign of the Son does " not, on Mr. Maurice's scheme, look back to " Bethlehem and Calvary, so neither does it look " forward to its consummation at the 'Great Assize,' " —the Judgment Day. For the Son to doom and " dismiss to punishment any sinners of mankind, " would be for Him to doom and put away Him- " self. The Son is, indeed, the Judge, now and " always; He will be such for ever. But He will " never pronounce a final sentence on either the " righteous or the wicked. And if there will be no " day of general judgment, neither of course will " there be a Resurrection Day. This, we need

Digitized by Google

" scarcely inform our readers, is the plain teaching " of the 'Essays.'

" There is, indeed, sin, that is, selfishness; and " there is a spirit of evil, Mr. Maurice teaches, which " tempts to sin. But there is no 'disease of nature,' " or 'corruption of the blood,' to remove or remedy. " There is no judicial sentence of God to annul or " avert. God, indeed, disapproves of all that is sel- " fish and unlovely in man, and wishes its removal. " But He retains no indignation for a broken *law:* " His *only* law—not legislative, but impulsive; not an " objective rule, but a subjective principle—is the law " of love, seeking to do away with evil in us and in " all. All pains and sorrows and sufferings, of what- " ever kind, here and hereafter, are not punish- " ments, but fatherly chastisements, flowing from " this law, and intended merely to amend and re- " claim. No sooner, therefore, does the sinner re- " linquish his selfishness, than God's purpose is en- " tirely accomplished. The pristine dignity of man is " restored. Not at any time can man be so far from " God as to be nearer to Satan. The Son of God is " ever more intimately near to man than the spirit " of evil. And when man sees how near the Son of " God is to him, when he perceives how He is one " with himself, and lies at the root of his humanity, " and how in Him he cannot but be one with the " Father also, and embraced in the Father's love, then " man gains his right place, and all is well.

" What relation is to be assigned to the Holy Spirit

Digitized by Google

"in this theology it is not easy to discover from what "Mr. Maurice says on the subject. To us he appears "to be put in the place of the Platonic or Neo- "Platonic soul of all things. All distinctions are "done away between the justified and the unjustified, "the regenerate and the unregenerate. All men are "equally justified in Christ, and all partake of the "same regeneration which has come upon the world "because of the appearance of the Son of God in "human nature. The Church is but the world open- "ing its eyes to the light which shines impartially "around all, and to the privileges which are equally "the right and possession of all. All men are alike "though not all equally 'inspired.' There are none "to whom the Spirit is given, as He is not given to "the world. Pagan prophets and philosophers were "moved by the same *afflatus* that stirred the souls "of Hebrew Seers and Christian Apostles. What "relic, then, is left of the Christian doctrine of the "influences of the Holy Spirit? The only fit de- "scription of His power and working, on this "scheme, is that of the Roman poet:—

"Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet,
Inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitæque volantûm,
Et quæ marmoreo fert monstra sub æquore pontus."

("Æneid," vi. 726—729.)*

Such were the sentiments of the School to which

* Extracted from Dr. Rigg's "Modern Anglican Theology," p. 139.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Kingsley belonged—he whom Mr. Cook describes as a "stalwart and intense soul"—"not easily cheated"—"substantially sound on what the Church of England regards as the essentials of Christian truth," and who died the death of a "martyr"!*

Martyr is a high and holy title. Did Mr. Kingsley live and die as a witness to Christ's Truth? Ah, no. He lived, and served, and died under quite another banner. The Word of God has said, "The whole world lieth in the wicked one —ἐν τῳ πονηρῳ." Pantheism replies, ""The whole world is in the Son and in the Father. All things were created in the Son."† Who can measure the vastness of this difference? Eternity, as I have already said, will alone disclose its extent. And yet Mr. Cook speaks of Pantheism having half-truth! Its dissonance with Truth is total.

* Mr. Cook's words are, "This modern martyr, who passed hence at the age of fifty-five, died as martyrs have died ever since the Apostolic age." (p. 38.)

† The translation of Colossians i. 16 is rightly given in our version—"All things were created by Him"—the same instrumental sense attaching to ἐν as does to the Hebrew בְּ. An influential living writer refuses to acknowledge this; and insists on reading ἐν αὐτῳ, "in Him." He should at once avow himself to be a pantheist. Pantheism is a leading tendency of the day.

The writers of this school continually confound the meaning of τα παντα and παντα. The meaning of τα παντα in numberless passages is, the totality of the things spoken of in the passage. Its extent must be defined by the context.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III.

REMARKS ON MR. COOK'S DOCTRINE RESPECTING SIN.

IF we fail in apprehending our utter ruin by the Fall, we can have no right thoughts either of God or of ourselves. We shall neither recognise His holiness, nor our own utter distance from Him. Whatever our knowledge may be, a worm will lie at the root of it all. Light may shine brightly around us, but we shall not receive it. We shall continue to grope in darkness.

We read in the Scripture that:—

"By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed unto (εἰς) all men on the ground that all sinned" (ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον). (Rom. v. 12.)*

* The ἐφ' ᾧ of verse 12 is as much a legal or forensic expression as καθιστημι or δικαιοω. It may be used either of a stipulation referring to the future, as when one person covenants to do so and so, *on condition that* (ἐφ' ᾧ) the other shall do so and so, or it may be used of an arrangement that has taken effect, as when we say, "You are deprived of your inheritance *on the ground that* your fathers have been guilty of treason." Compare the use of ἐφ' ᾧγε and ἐφ' ὅτῳ, in the following passage:—εἰ γαρ ἐγενου ἐφ' ᾧγε διατελειν ἐυτυχων

Digitized by Google

"By one man's offence death reigned by one." (Rom. v. 17.)

"By one man's disobedience the many were constituted sinners" (*ἁμαρτωλοι κατεσταθησαν οἱ πολλοι*). (Rom. v. 19.)

On the ground of these and like texts, orthodox Protestantism has ever taught that Adam's first sin (God having appointed to us legal oneness with him) is imputed to all his natural descendants, so that they inherit his condemnation. As a consequence of the imputation of the guilt of Adam's "apostatizing act," as Turretine calls it, * we are born with a corrupt nature. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" and in the flesh "no good thing dwelleth." Sin (which is in Rom. v., vi., and vii., personified) is described as reigning *around* us, *over* us, and *in* us, and directing all our energies against God. "Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence." The mind of the flesh (*φρονημα σαρκος*), *i.e.*, all our intellectual and moral powers; all our powers of thought, feeling and affection, are not only turned away from God, but are "enmity

---

ἀει, si enim eâ lege natus es, ut perpetuâ felicitate finaris (Menand. apud Plut.), and, *ἐμε μηδεν ἐχεις ἐφ' ὁτῳ τουτο ποιησεις*, You have no ground on which to do this to me. (See Steph. Therm.)

* See the valuable remarks of Dr. Hodge on this subject in his work on "The Atonement," chap. vii. p. 103.

Digitized by Google

against God." "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. viii. 7.)

Very full is the testimony of the Reformed Confessions to this great and solemn truth.

"Man is gone as far as possible (quam longissime) from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh always lusteth contrary to the Spirit." —(Art. ix. "English Confession.")

"Man of his own nature is fleshly and carnal, corrupt and naught, sinful and disobedient to God: without any spark of goodness in him; without any virtuous or godly motions; only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds."—("Homily," xxviii. 1.)

Mr. Cook's estimate, however, of fallen man is far different from this. Of the imputation of Adam's first sin (a truth to which the Scripture and orthodox Protestantism give so great prominence) he makes no mention. His system apparently can find no place for it. To the moral condition, however, of fallen man, he refers often. On page 21, he speaks of the "*white* lives that come into the world,* and go out of it before they are stained with responsible evil." Is it true that "*white* lives" come into the world when infants

* Observe, Mr. Cook is here speaking of a life, ζωη, which infants *bring into the world with them*, not of a life, βιος, which they have *not* lived, and which they could not bring into the world with them. He says elsewhere that "bad *tendencies*" are not sin, therefore such tendencies would not, in his judgment, take from an infant's soul whiteness.

Digitized by Google

are born?* They have indeed committed no personal transgression, and therefore no *personal* transgression is or could be laid to their account. Yet when they come into the world "death reigneth over them," and sin dwelleth in them. How then can they be described as having "*white* lives," when the seed-principle of all iniquity is

* Sin, in the sense of personal transgression, is not set down (οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται) in the book of God against any who have not broken some commandment which they either did recognise, or should have recognised. This, of course, is the case with infants and irresponsible persons (such as idiots) *only*. They break no recognised commandment: they know neither *the* Law nor *a* law. Consequently nothing is registered against them on that page of the book of account on which personal transgression is registered. Nevertheless they die. They became subject to death long before the Law which pronounced its formal curse on sin was given. "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," *i.e.*, by breaking a recognised commandment. If, therefore, no personally committed sin was registered against them, they could not have died on that account, but must have died on the ground (ἐφ' ᾧ) of another's sin having been imputed to them.

It is certain that all infants who die in irresponsible infancy are chosen in Christ, and through His grace saved: for we find as a description universally pertaining to all who shall finally stand before the great white Throne and be condemned, that they are to be judged "out of things which were written in the books according to their works." This is a description which cannot apply to those who have died in irresponsible infancy.

Digitized by Google

hidden in them, just as that which is afterwards developed in the oak lies hidden in the acorn? "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Children of wrath." Such is the aspect in which Scripture bids us view our natural condition. They who are born "children of wrath," with sin dwelling in them, cannot be regarded as bringing into the world "white lives." There is nothing *white* in them, nor ever would be, unless Almighty grace were pleased (as it is pleased) to grant to every babe that dies in infancy, acceptance and life through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. When they are brought by a sovereign act of grace under the shelter, and under the preciousness of His blood, they have whiteness—but never before. Thus the infant, and Paul, and the thief that turned to Jesus on the cross, enter into glory precisely on the same title—the righteousness of their God and Saviour. They stand under a meritoriousness not their own.

On page 89 Mr. Cook says:—

"Man is born with his back towards God.* *That is original sin*.....Accredited New England theology does not assert that

* The statement that "man is born with his back toward God" (a phrase first used by Mr. Moody) is in itself unobjectionable: but when Mr. Cook adds "*That is original sin*," etc., etc., he treads on ground that Mr. Moody has not trodden.

Digitized by Google

evil disposition is sin: for it teaches always that responsibility cannot exist without freedom of the will, and that sin consists in evil choice."

On page 24 also, we read:—

"Inherited bad tendencies, which, although not sin, are the copious fountain of evil choice."

This is just what Irving taught. "I deny," said Mr. Irving, "that it is unholiness to be tempted through the mind, provided that the will yield not to the evil suggestion, provided that the will consent not to the evil consciousness." (Irving's "Orthodox Doctrine," p. 158.) Elsewhere he says, "I believe it to be most orthodox, and of the substance and essence of the orthodox faith, to hold that Christ could say until the resurrection, 'Not I, but sin that tempteth Me in My flesh,' just as after His resurrection He could say, 'I am separate from sinners.'" (p. 127.)

If "evil disposition" and "bad tendencies" (no matter whence derived) be not sin, why may they not be admitted into heaven? Nothing is excluded thence except that which is sinful. "Sin," says Mr. Cook, "is evil choice." But desire precedes "choice," and Scripture says *οὐκ ἐπιθυμησεις*—"thou shalt not *desire*," that is, thou shalt not desire anything that is evil. God's commandment is directed not against the choice primarily, but against the *desire* which leads to the "choice." The Scripture speaks of our being "baited and

Digitized by Google

allured" by evil desire (ἐπιθυμια). Must not that by which we are baited and drawn on to evil, be itself evil? The Scripture says that evil desire (ἐπιθυμια) conceives and brings forth sin, *i.e.*, manifested sin. Must not that which is the parent of manifested sin, be itself sin? In the fifth, sixth and seventh of Romans sin is (as I have already said) personified. It is spoken of as if it were an unclean demon dwelling in us, and working, whenever occasion serves, all manner of evil desire or, as it is translated, concupiscence (ἐπιθυμια), which concupiscence precedes "choice" and action. Is not that which worketh in us such concupiscence, sin? The order is this. Indwelling sin works evil desire: evil desire leads to choice: choice leads to manifested sin or transgression. Sin is the source of all, and permeates all. The whole process is one of sin.

Perhaps there is nothing on which real Christians have in all ages been more entirely agreed, than in their sentiments respecting sin—that it consists not in the outward act, nor in the deliberate purpose of the soul only, but in the secret unseen propensity or bias of the human mind. It is a thing which the children of God daily know and feel to be *in itself* sin, though *for Christ's sake* not imputed to those who believe. It is their burden and their sorrow, for it lusteth against the Spirit, in order that they might not do the things that they would. "The concupiscence of the flesh,

Digitized by Google

against which the good Spirit lusteth is, not only the punishment of sin and the cause of sin, but it is also sin." (Augustine.) "This infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek φρονημα σαρκος, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." (English Articles.)

So also the French Protestant Confession. "We believe that this *stain is truly sin*; because that it makes all and every man (not so much as those little ones excepted which as yet lie hid in their mothers' womb) guilty of eternal death before God. We also affirm that this stain even after baptism, is, in its nature sin as concerning the fault." The Confession then goes on to state that, though sin, it is not imputed to them that believe.

So also the Lutheran Confession. "These defects and this concupiscence, are things damnable, and of their own nature worthy of death. And this original blot is sin, indeed, condemning, and bringing eternal death."

And lastly, the Confession of Saxony. "This whole corruption we say to be sin, and not only a punishment of sin, and a thing indifferent..... *Ambiguities are to be avoided in the Church.* There-

Digitized by Google

fore we expressly call these evils, corruption; which is often called by ancient writers, evil concupiscence. .....This evil concupiscence we say to be sin; and we affirm that this whole doctrine of sin, as it is set forth and taught in our Churches, is a doctrine which has had the perpetual consent of the true Church of God."

Here are the testimonies of many saints. But the testimony of the Scripture is conclusive; for it teaches us that this corruption both when resisted, and what is more, when so dormant as to be unknown even to ourselves, is sin in the sight of God. "I had not *known* sin but by the law, for I had not *known* lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." The law did not create the sin, it did not create the evil tendency, but it manifested its existence, and made the Apostle know that sin was in him. And therefore the very object of the chapter is to show that since restraint and resistance could effect no change in our bodies of sin, restraint and resistance could therefore open no way of deliverance or hope. It is this fact which is made by God the foundation of His scheme of mercy. The necessity of God's creating "A new thing in the earth" (for these are the words in which Scripture describes the miraculous generation of the Lord), that so we might be made new creatures *in Him*, is grounded on this truth of evil tendency being in itself sin.

We cannot wonder that Mr. Cook, differing from

Digitized by Google

all the Protestant Confessions, and maintaining that "evil disposition" is not in itself sin, should refuse to declare man to be utterly "corrupt," and should tone down the picture of his moral corruption thus. Speaking of men under the likeness of a clock disarranged, but not unarrangeable, he says:

"This moral condition is not total corruption: it is disarrangedness; it is not unarrangeability. MAN IS NOBLE: the wheels in him are of gold, of silver, and of pearl, of an unmeasured preciousness. They are so disarranged, however, as not to keep time; and that condition we call total *depravity*. If they were concrete-slime (as they are not) we should call that condition total *corruption*." (P. 89.)

Mr. Cook here speaks of man's moral condition being one of disarrangement merely. The Scripture says that man morally is "*dead* in trespasses and sins." His relation towards good and towards God is one not of incapacity merely through disarrangement: it is a relation of "death." Is death disarrangement merely? But this is not all. Though dead to God, he is alive unto Satan. "You hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the Prince of the power of the air, the Spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit." "Lusteth" is a word implying life and energy.

"The mind of the flesh (*φρονημα σαρκος*) is ENMITY against God." Mr. Cook's illustration,

Digitized by Google

therefore, is utterly misleading. Even if he had used the illustration of "concrete-slime" (an illustration which he refuses to use because he says it would be too strong) even such a description would have been altogether inadequate to denote that condition of living enmity against God that characterizes fallen man. To say that man "is born with his back towards God," and that "*that is original sin*," is misleading, and untrue. Man is a rebel who turns his face towards God and defies Him. His condition is not one of passivity, like that of a deranged machine: it is a condition of vigorous and active enmity. "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways: and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes." This is a condition that no mere re-arrangement can remedy. Every beam, every stone in a leprous house was commanded to be removed. When the vessel that was being made was marred upon the wheel, it was set aside, and the potter framed one anew. The ruined condition of man can (according to God's appointment) be remedied only by abolition. There must be Regeneration; and Regeneration is something more than rectification. We must be "born again." In virtue of our legal oneness with our Surety we pass, as repre-

Digitized by Google

sented by Him, through judicial death, and rise from it into association with Him in glory. New life through the Spirit, altogether different from that which the earthy Adam had in Paradise, must be given. Redeemed man must be brought into a new creation whereof it can be said, "Old things have passed away: all things have become new." This is something very different from re-arrangement. But all these things, the illustration and the statements of Mr. Cook ignore.

But more than this. Not only does Mr. Cook think man to be "noble," and his moral condition to be one of "disarrangement" merely; he further believes that there is in him something divine. In page 184 he says,

"It is held by the acutest scholarship that the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world is one with the Holy Ghost, shed forth from our ascended Lord. Go to your Dorner and Martensen and Rothe, and all the best students of religious science, from the side of ethics and evangelical truth, and you will find them rejoicing to illustrate in all detail, and with the full radiance of philosophy as well as of evangelical learning, the truth that the Holy Spirit is the present Christ; and they identify it with the innermost holiest of conscience."

And again on pages 50 and 51, we read:

"Is it affirmed that we must worship God in conscience? What do you mean by conscience? The human part of the intuitive moral sense, or that divine Somewhat or Some One who is revealed by the moral law, and is in us, but not of us? If you mean the latter, we do, in the name of every text in the Oldest and the Old, the Newest and the New

Digitized by Google

Testament, worship it as 'the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' But of that light we read that in the beginning it was with God, and was God."

Astounding statements these! Man must indeed be more than "noble," if Christ be in him. We are to regard our conscience, or a part thereof, as being Christ. Our conscience if not actually one with the light that lighteth every man, is supposed to be so associated or conjoined with that Light as to be virtually one therewith. Consequently, all men have the indwelling presence of God; and we may worship conscience if by that is meant that "Somewhat or Some One that is in us, but not of us." We cannot wonder that the views of Maurice and Kingsley and others of the Alexandrine School respecting the Trinity and man's association therewith, should be irresistibly attractive to Mr. Cook whilst he holds such views respecting conscience and the indwelling Light. It is very evident that if Christ be in every man, every man must be in Christ.

Mr. Cook would accord also with the Alexandrine School in their views respecting sin. They and he would agree in saying that concupiscence is not sin. Protestantism and the Bible are abandoned wherever such views are held. Mr. Cook indeed appeals to another Testament which he calls the Oldest—a Testament, however, that we recognise not. The consideration of this I reserve to another chapter.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Cook's Four Testaments.

In the preceding chapter I have quoted certain words of Mr. Cook, in which he speaks of "the Oldest and the Old, the Newest and the New Testament." Throughout his work he appeals to "the Oldest Testament," as he is pleased to term it. This "Oldest Testament," is something that is *unwritten*—something that God has not promulgated as the expression of His will — something that is neither itself a Testament, nor speaks of any Testament, and yet it is not only called by Mr. Cook a Testament, but is pronounced to be "The Oldest Testament," and is by him exalted into parity with, if not into superiority over, the written Word of God.

I will now quote some of Mr. Cook's statements respecting this "Oldest Testament" which he so much honours. I will endeavour to quote accurately, and to state the meaning which the words seem intended to convey, but I will not affirm that on every point I have accurately discerned his meaning, or that I am able to unravel all his thoughts. I must leave the full explication to persons more instructed in these mysteries than

Digitized by Google

myself. I will do my best, however, to thread my way through the labryinth.

Mr. Cook says :—

"If by nature you mean that Power of Intelligence and Choice which is behind all natural law, we do worship the God revealed by the Oldest Testament, or the Nature of Things. But this we understand to be the very God revealed by the New Testament and the Newest." (P. 50.)

"Your Oldest Testament says the nature of things is without variableness or shadow of turning." (P. 51.)

Here the Oldest Testament which is before defined to be "the Nature of Things," is said to state something respecting the "Nature of Things," that is, it states something respecting itself, and what it states is, that it is without "variableness or shadow of turning." This implies that the "Oldest Testament," or "Nature of Things," is another name for God. Accordingly we find Mr. Cook elsewhere saying :—

"The Oldest Testament is fearfully orthodox." (P. 51.)

And again :—

"Is all Science asleep, that we do not see that the nature of all things is—He whom we dare not name"! (P. 141.)

Again on p. 52 we find the following passage :—

"Mr. Clarke [a Unitarian] says that 'Christianity teaches not the sovereignty of the nature of things, but the sovereignty of the divine love;' and another liberal critic has affirmed,

Digitized by Google

that, if God be such a Being as the New Testament represents Him to be, He will make short work with the nature of things. What astounding confusion of thought is this, and what misunderstanding of the Oldest Testament and the Old, the Newest and the New! God make short work with the nature of things! What is the nature of things? By definition it is the total outcome of the Divine perfections. God make short work with His own infinite justice and holiness, His own intellectual excellence, and with it all that is implied in the infinitude of the Divine nature! What we call the nature of things is but another name for all the requirements of the Divine free choice; and is an infinitely perfect Being to make short work of that? God Himself making short work with the nature of things? God a suicide? These phrases mean the same thing. *It will be of importance for you and me to have no war with the nature of things until the day when God ceases to be God.*"

From this it would appear that "the nature of things" (being "by definition the outcome of the Divine perfections," and being "another name for all the requirements of the Divine free choice") is to be regarded as God, so that by considering aright "the nature of things" as presented to us in that volume of the Universe which is open to us, we become acquainted with God, who is thus the "Oldest Testament," because He is the revealer of Himself in the "nature of things" before anything was written. I understand this to be the meaning of these extraordinary passages. If I have erred in explaining them rightly, I have erred unwittingly.

The power by which we are enabled to appre-

Digitized by Google

hend "the nature of things," that is God, is to be found in conscience; not "the human part of the intuitive moral sense," but "that divine Somewhat or Some One who is revealed by the moral law, and is in us but not of us," even "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." (P. 51.)* Thus God, in man, knows, contemplates, and has fellowship with God in "the nature of things": for God must recognise His own perfectness. Thus man has in his natural condition a power whereby he may have fellowship with God. How this consorts with the Scripture testimony that we are "dead in sins," does not appear. Here, apparently the testimony of the written Word and of the "Oldest Testament" jar, and the latter rules.

The authority which Mr. Cook attaches to the voice of conscience is strikingly shown in that part of the following passage which I have italicized.

"With the emphasis of his hand upon his heart, a scholar whom I suppose to be the best representative of the learning

* Mr. Cook's words are "Is it affirmed that we must worship God in conscience? What do you mean by conscience? The human part of the intuitive moral sense, or that divine Somewhat or Some One, who is revealed by the moral law, and is in us, but not of us? If you mean the latter, we do, in the name of every text in the Oldest and the Old, the Newest and the New Testament, worship it as 'the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world.' But of that light we read that in the beginning it was with God, and was God." ("Orthodoxy," p. 51.)

Digitized by Google

of unevangelical Christianity in this country, a professor, who lives not a hundred miles from Boston, said to me in the Athenæum Library lately, without any cross-questioning from me, 'There is a difficulty in conscience as to our peace, when we once have sinned; and that difficulty in the structure of human nature has sustained the doctrine of the vicarious Atonement, before the attacks of philosophy, century after century.' He seemed to think that he was pointing to a proof-text of not much consequence; but to me *this human nature, the serious volume he thus put aside in order to read some more authoritative proof-text out of the Scriptures, was itself the oldest scripture; was that scripture in harmony with which all other scripture must be interpreted; was, in short the supreme although not all-sufficing revelation of God by being a revelation of the unity of the moral law,—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.*" (P. 186.)

I doubt whether in all the writings of the Alexandrine School, ancient and modern, we could find a more astounding statement than this. Human nature—that human nature which is dead towards God and alive towards Satan, is itself the oldest Scripture, yea, that "scripture in harmony with which all other scripture must be interpreted, is in short, the SUPREME although not all-sufficing revelation"! To ascribe any such condition even to the regenerate in whom the Spirit of Christ dwells, would be utterly false; but to say that the unregenerate have in them a SUPREME REVELATION in harmony with which all other scripture must be interpreted, is an assertion negatived by every thing that God hath written from Genesis

Digitized by Google

to Revelation. It is very certain that if Mr. Cook's "Oldest Testament" leads to such conclusions as these, it leads not to God, but far away from Him.

Through a lengthened Christian life, I have had frequent opportunities of intercourse with persons who have trusted to the guidance of that inward light of which Mr. Cook speaks: but I have never met with one who did not reject Atonement *as taught in the Scripture*, and also the completeness of the ruin wrought by the Fall. Man cannot be dead in trespasses and sins if there be something DIVINE in him. Some time ago, in conversing with a person who was evidently a stranger to the Gospel of the grace of God, though strong in his convictions as to the potency of the inner light, I pressed on him the text, "without shedding of blood there is no remission." He replied, "I know the Apostle says so, but his words do not commend themselves to the witness that is within me, and I reject them."

Fichte (one of the writers whom Kingsley praises) was a person who spoke much of finding God in his own breast. "Dost thou long to see God as He is face to face? Do not seek Him behind the clouds; thou canst find Him where thou art. Look at the life of one who has given himself up to Him, and thou wilt behold Him: give thyself to Him, and *thou wilt find Him in thine own breast.*" ("Life of Fichte," p. 166.)

Digitized by Google

Yet what were Fichte's conclusions? "It could not be said of him," says his biographer, "that he denied that God had an existence, *but he expressed no decided opinion on the subject*.....When St. John speaks of 'the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world,' and 'of the blood which cleanseth us from all sin,' the idea conveyed to Fichte's mind was not His blood shed for the remission of sins, but *His blood, His Spirit within us.*" (Ibid., p. 167.)

The history of Hicksite Quakerism in America affords many like examples. There is a necessary tendency towards this kind of doctrine wherever it is believed that Christ is in every man.

The following quotation from Mr. Cook I had not observed when I commenced to write this section. It more than confirms all that I have said.

"According to my view of the Unity of the Divine nature God is one, as we meet Him in the Old Testament and the Oldest; in the New and the Newest. There are four Testaments: an Oldest and an Old, a New and a Newest. The Oldest Testament is the Nature of Things. The Newest is Christ's Continued Life in the Present Influences of the Holy Spirit. The Oldest and Newest are unwritten; the Old and New are written. But the voices of the four are one. Singularly enough, too, the scenery of the four Testaments is one and the same Holy Land; and he who does not feel at home in them all may well suspect the thoroughness of his knowledge of either. Carlyle calls Luther what the future will call Carlyle: 'Great, not as a hewn obelisk, but as an Alpine mountain; unsubduable granite, piercing far and wide into the heavens;

Digitized by Google

yet in the clefts of it fountains, green beautiful valleys with flowers.' This is a good map of the human conscience as we know it scientifically. This, too, fairly understood, is a good map of the Old Testament, and of the New, and of the Newest. If the Old Testament Scripture is at once severe and tender; if in all its gnarled, unsubduable heights, there burst out springs of crystalline water; if, in the inaccessible ruggedness of its peaks, we find green places, soft with celestial visitation of showers and of dew; if there is in the written Word a combination of the Alpine and of the Paradisiacal, unfathomable justice matched by unfathomable tenderness; so in the Newest Testament and in the Oldest —that is to say, in History and in the Nature of Things— *we find in the deepest clefts, the springs that do most to quench our thirst!* I, therefore, shall dare to ask you to hang over the great chasm in the nature of things, because at the bottom of these spring up the waters which are the healing of the nations." (P. 13.)

Amidst all the extravagancies of ancient and modern Pantheism, I doubt whether any can be found to exceed this. Luther, as delineated by Carlyle, Carlyle as about to be delineated by posterity, supply us with "a good map of the human conscience as we know it scientifically," and with a "good map of the Old Testament, and of the New, and of the Newest." In all will be found something gnarled and rugged, but in all will be discovered, as in the clefts of an Alpine mountain, beautiful valleys with fountains and streams of crystalline waters that, in some cases, at any rate, will be found to be "the healing of the nations." The written Word of God is not altogether ignored.

Digitized by Google

It may be permitted to rank (1) with conscience, (2) with men like Luther, (3) with men like Carlyle, (4) with the nature of things—Naturus, (5) with Christ in history—which last may mean (if it means anything) the estimate which our own misguided intellects may choose to form of certain developments which men call progress, and which they sanctify in the name of Christ.

I have heard that Carlyle was wont to glory in having been the person who moulded the character and shaped the course of poor Sterling. Am I to form, from Sterling's life and Sterling's death, my judgment of the result of drinking of those waters that flowed forth from the depths of Carlyle's Alpine soul? A terrible result it was—one that might well cause horror to take hold upon me.

May I for a moment be allowed to speak as in parable. I imagine myself to dream. I find myself wandering in a wilderness. My soul

> "With cares and sins opprest,
> Finds on earth no peace or rest."

I see in the distance a Tabernacle, and over it a cloudy pillar. I approach, and find it to be an "appointed meeting-place" for Jehovah and sinful man. I see an unblemished victim. I hear a voice which I recognise as the voice of God. It bids me approach the victim, and lay both my hands upon its holy head, and to lean upon it, and become associated with it, as having qualities of which I am

Digitized by Google

utterly devoid. I see it slain and burnt as a holocaust on the altar, whence its fragrance ascends as a sweet savour—"a savour of rest before Jehovah." I find myself covered with that fragrance, and accepted according to its excellency.

The scene changes. I find myself in a solitary spot. Again an unblemished victim stands before me. My sins rise up to the remembrance of my soul. I hear a voice saying, "Let those sins rest upon the head of that victim." I see it covered, as it were, with the scarlet of my sins. I see it slain and given to the devouring fire, which burns it up (שָׂרַף) till ashes only remain.

The scene again changes. I see a Priest, clothed in garments of glory and of beauty, standing in the presence of Jehovah for me. On his breastplate precious stones, effulgent with heavenly light, shine, and on those stones were names written, and amongst them my own. My soul rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory, when suddenly I hear a stern voice (it is Carlyle's) exclaiming, "Hebrew old clothes;" and then another kindred voice responding, "It is a religion of the shambles." I was bidden to take the roll on which Leviticus is written, and that on which the Epistle to the Hebrews is written, and to bind them with a weight of lead, and to sink them in the depths of the sea. I awake. The vision passes, but its effects remain. I see that the conscience of unregenerate men, shrinking from light, and burying itself in darkness, uniformly

Digitized by Google

rejects and stigmatizes the paths into which the Scripture and the Spirit of Christ leads. How could it be otherwise? Is not Satan the God of this age? Does he not work in all the children of disobedience? Do not all his servants hate the light and love darkness? The Scripture says they are ἀθεοι. Christ, therefore, cannot be in them.

Are men like Carlyle, or men generally, because they have in them conscience (a mere natural faculty which, like all our other natural faculties, is marred, perverted, and darkened by the Fall)—are all men because they have a conscience, to be regarded as the oracles of God, and to be ranked with the Scriptures of Truth? It would seem so from the enumeration just given. Whatever difference there may be in the various classes enumerated, it seems to be regarded as a difference in degree merely, not in kind. I am to look to Carlyle as to one in the recesses of whose Alpine soul are to be found streams comparable to those which flow forth from Scripture and from God. And yet, how vast, how palpable the difference: for these men often curse that which God blesses. When that which comes from the Alpine depths of the human heart, and from the Alpine depths of the Word of God are found in this antagonism, which are we to receive? Where am I to find the determining test? If I understand Mr. Cook aright I must turn to "the Oldest Testament" or "the nature of things," and seek the help of "intuition, instinct, experiment, and syllogism,"

Digitized by Google

and so be guided. Must we not infer this from the following passage? He likens himself to the sorrowful minstrel who wandered in search of the imprisoned Richard.

"I go up and down in search of scientific theology. I am a poor musician, looking for my Lord. I am not admitted to the inner vaults of all castles. I know not where He may be confined among the mysteries of the universe. Science knows, however, that somewhere He remembers a delicious strain of music, which both Revelation and Science heard in their youth. Religion and Science both have the nature of things as their earliest memory. Self-evident truth is the delicious strain of music which I will lift up under the barred windows of castle after castle, until from some tower I have a token indicating to me that my Lord is there. I know He heard that melody of self-evident truth when He was young; for the Old Testament was preceded by the Oldest, and it is only self-evident truth. Among the perplexities of the universe I will lift up the melody of axioms, self-evident propositions, intuitive truths, until out of the bars of mystery shall be thrown down a token of my Lord, and He and I are together once more.

"Theodore Parker held that the Divine Perfection is the first of all theological truths; and so did David when he struck his harp at the edge of Siloa's Brook; so did Æschylus when he smote his under the shadow of the Acropolis; so have all lofty and clear souls taught that God is the fulness of all excellence; and every just inference we can draw from that fact is scientific. Contrast, however, a false with a true optimism, or Parker's inferences from the fact of God's perfection with Christian inferences from the same fact." (P. 152.)

I will not remark much upon this. I certainly think that we shall be, and long continue to be, wanderers, if we refuse to receive any but "self-

Digitized by Google

evident" truths. I have been accustomed to think that God expected His children to receive that which He teaches, not on the ground of its being self-evident, but on the ground of the wisdom, truthfulness, and authority of Himself who teaches it. I do not regard the doctrine of an eternal self-existent Being, or the existence of that Being in a Trinity of Persons—nor, indeed, any of the great distinctive Truths of Revelation—as being self-evident doctrines.

Moreover, if this scientific way of attaining truth by intuition and the like be open to men, it seems very marvellous that the history of the past 6,000 years should have been what it has been.

We have also to inquire whether Mr. Cook, who has adopted this scientific method, has been led by it into the acceptance of, or into the rejection of that which the written Word of God teaches. It is very evident that his doctrines as to creation, the resurrection of the body, sin, conscience, the Divine Immanency, and many like things, are not those which the Scripture teaches.

Mr. Cook, it should be observed, classes Æschylus (one who is not exempted from the awful description given of idolatrous Paganism in Romans i.) with David, who could say, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was in my tongue." Is there no essential difference between the holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and aliens—men "without hope," and "without God"? See Eph. ii. 12.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Cook speaks of the tragedies of ancient Athens (that focus of adorned demonolatry) as having "a *voice which even now, as we read them, is to the ear of thought a majestic, philosophical, or theological anthem. Æschylus, and Sophocles, and Euripides, so taught ethics and religion, that the stage in the ancient Athenian democracy must be compared to the pulpit in modern times.*" (P. 131.) No doubt that the pulpit may be so debased as to become the organ of natural and philosophic thought, or it may be the place where Christ and *revealed truth* is magnified.

Mr. Cook finds the origin of the Crusades in the value which Christianity has had for the body!! He says:

"Christianity so values the body, that a Holy Sepulchre, where once an angel sat at the head, and another angel at the feet, not of a body, but of a place where a body had lain, drew to it all Europe in crusade after crusade, making the Italian cities rich, founding the Hanse Towns, wrenching liberty for the municipal classes out of the gripe of nobles, and so, in ultimate result, writing Magna Charta and the American Constitution. It is historically true to say that the crusades put the ballot in the poor man's hand, or began liberty; and they were in great measure the outcome of the reverence of Christianity for the incontrovertible fact that a physical frame had been the supreme human temple of the Holy Ghost." (P. 130).

I quote this principally because I suppose it may be taken as an example of his "Newest Testament," that is, "Christ in history." As respects the recognition of the divine perfection by Theodore

Digitized by Google

Parker, and others, I will only say that it is very easy for men to imagine to themselves a God, and to invest Him with such attributes as seem fitting in their sight, and so to worship Him: but do they worship the God whom the Scriptures reveal? Do they accept God's own account of His character and ways, and methods, past, present, and to come? God abstractedly reverenced, and God reverenced according to that which He hath authoritatively revealed Himself to be, are two widely different things.*

* It appears to me that any system which speaks of "the nature of things" being God, cannot (whatever safeguards it may surround itself with) free itself from complicity with the system which, as Bushnell says, makes God *Naturus*, and which he thus condemns :—"The pantheistic form of naturalism, it is well known, makes a very different account of the abortions and deformities of the world, and also of its future possibilities. It assumes, for a fact, that nature is an incomplete or partially developed form of being, going on toward perfection, under laws of development contained in itself; therefore necessarily plunging into mischances, and producing uncomely or imperfect fruits. Accordingly God, who is in fact the all of nature, is a tardy but sublime Naturus, who is some time about to be, if He can attain to a more complete consciousness in His children, and be cleared of the blundering process of development by which necessity is at work to shape Him into order. Meantime, we ourselves are blundering on with Him, they suppose, undergoing a like development, and excuse ourselves from all blame in it, because we are only parts of nature, subject to her laws; parts, that is, of God, and subject to the eternal fate that rules Him."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V.

THE PUNISHMENT DUE TO THE SINS OF GOD'S PEOPLE BORNE BY THEIR HOLY SUBSTITUTE.

ON page 134 of Mr. Cook's book "Orthodoxy," we find a list of twelve propositions embodying objections made by Unitarian writers to the Atonement.

Of these propositions nine may be regarded as misrepresentations or caricatures. Worded as they are, none would defend them. Nevertheless it is our duty to rescue the truth that lies hid under the caricature. We are not to abandon truth that men have chosen to mingle up with error. The chaff should be separated from the wheat, and the wheat preserved. This, however, has not been done.

The two propositions that stand first in the list of rejection are these :—

"Christ, although innocent, was punished."

"God punishes by substitution."

These propositions are unexceptionable: there is no inaccuracy of expression. Nevertheless, these two propositions, so precious and so true, we are

Digitized by Google

asked not only to resign, but to "abhor." Mr. Cook says of all the twelve propositions, "these propositions evangelical scholarship not only does not teach, but abhors." (P. 135.)

It is true indeed that Mr. Cook would not ask us to "abhor" these two propositions unless he had first consented to allow the Unitarians and others to put on the word "punish" a sense of their own. The Unitarians insist on limiting the meaning of the word punishment, to inflictions incurred by *personal ill-desert*, and *assume* that it must be so understood in the propositions before us.*

Here I would in the first place ask, what right have the Unitarians, or any others, thus to limit the use of the word "punish." If punishment can only be inflicted on those who are personally blameworthy, how is it that we are born out of Paradise? As infants we have committed no *personal* sin. And yet death reigns even over those "who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." It reigns over idiots and infants who have never *personally* transgressed. We are born into a groan-

* It is *impossible* that this proposition should bear the meaning that the Unitarians wish to put upon it. What proposition which affirmed that a person had no personal demerit, could affirm that that person was punished for personal demerit? The Unitarians know very well that the proposition means that Christ, who had no personal demerit, was punished in the stead of those who *had* personal demerit. *Vicarious punishment* is that which they deny. Shall we abandon or weaken the word punishment to please them?

Digitized by Google

ing world, born too with a corrupted nature. We are born to sorrow. Are not all these things punishments—penal inflictions because of a sin which we did not *personally* commit? They *are* punishments. They are so spoken of in Scripture: and every one who reflects, feels that they are punishments. Is it no punishment to be reigned over by Death? It is a proof that "judgment" has come upon us "unto condemnation." It is, therefore, right, and in accordance with Scripture, to speak of persons being punished who have not brought on themselves the punishment by personal transgression.

What then is the reason of this dislike of the word "punish"? Is the objection directed against this particular word only, or is it extended to *all* words that are used to imply penal infliction? Is it intended to affirm that Christ, as the Surety of His believing people, bore no penal inflictions in their stead?

There is a strong, and, I suppose, increasing body of theologians in America, who hold what is there called the Governmental Theory of the Atonement, which now, says Dr. Hodge, holds a recognised place in that doctrinal system which is distinctively called the "New England Theology." (Hodge "On Atonement," p. 204.)

Among the principles of this School, this is one. "They insist" (I quote from Dr. Hodge) "*that it is of the essence of penalty that it be inflicted upon the sinner in person.*" Fiske insists that God's justice

Digitized by Google

can no more be satisfied by the vicarious suffering of another than the sinful agent, than a man's thirst can be slaked by another man's vicariously drinking water for him. . . . . They thus ceaselessly oscillate between the two [*i.e.* the two systems of doctrine, orthodox and Socinian], orthodox in all they affirm, and Socinian in all they deny." (Hodge, pp. 307, 308, 310.)*

* It may be best, perhaps, to quote Dr. Hodge's remarks in full. Speaking of the Governmental Theory sanctioned by this school, Dr. Hodge observes :

"The truth is, that this Governmental Theory is an invention designed to escape the pressure of Socinian objections levelled against the true doctrine of the Atonement. The point at which rational objections to the true doctrine of the Atonement are most efficient is that which concerns the satisfaction of strict justice in the person substituted in the place of the actual criminal. In order to avoid this objection, the advocates of the Governmental Hypothesis admit its force, deny that Christ was punished in the place of sinners, or that He satisfies the demands of distributive justice at all, and claim that the death of Christ was a contrivance to take the place of the penalty of the law, and to make it consistent with God's rectoral righteousness to omit the penalty in the case of believers altogether. But Jowett says truly: 'This second theory has no advantage over the preceding [orthodox], *except that which the more shadowy statement must ever have in rendering difficulties themselves more shadowy.*' Whenever they attempt a precise statement, in opposition to the Socinians, of their positive belief as to the manner in which the sufferings of Christ are related to the sins of His people and of the manner in which His sufferings, which are no penalty, avail to express God's abhorrence of sin, or to make

Digitized by Google

Whether this New England School originated the objection to the use of the word *punishment*, or whether they adopted it from some other quarter, it is of little moment to determine. Their principle is, "*that it is of the essence of penalty that it be inflicted upon the sinner in person.*" If this be so, it is obvious that the Lord Jesus could have endured no penalties. Therefore punishment, and not only punishment, but every other word expressive of penalty is to be abandoned, and "abhorred."

Now how are we to determine this question? Are we to reason about it? We should dispute for ever. The Scripture alone can determine it. The question is simply this:—May *the same* penal words

---

it consistent with His rectoral justice to omit the penalty altogether, they *always* necessarily fall back upon the fundamental principles of the Satisfaction doctrine. And again, the very moment they turn to distinguish their position from that Church doctrine which includes their special theory as one of its provinces, they always necessarily fall back in their negations upon Socinian ground. *They thus ceaselessly oscillate between the two—orthodox in all they affirm, and Socinian in all they deny.*"

Again he says, "It is utterly impossible for the advocates of this theory to show the connection between the sufferings of Christ and the effects which, they say, flow from it. They insist that it is of the essence of penalty that it be inflicted upon the sinner in person. Fiske insists that God's justice can no more be satisfied by the vicarious suffering of another than the sinful agent, than a man's thirst can be slaked by another man's vicariously drinking water for him."

Digitized by Google

which are applied to those who suffer for their own sins be used also of Christ as the Surety? This question is decided for us by the Word of God. The very same words which the Scripture applies to punished sinners, it applies also to the punished Surety. It is not a mere question about the meaning of a particular English expression. The original words of Scripture are said by the Apostle to be words "taught of the Holy Ghost,"* and are therefore authoritative. If this be not owned, it is best to abandon controversy, for we should have no common standard of appeal; and so, as I have already said, we might dispute for ever.

In the Epistle to the Galatians I find the following words: "Christ redeemed us [believers] from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Was death under the curse of the Law no penal infliction? Did not Christ suffer under the curse of that same Law whose curse will finally fall on the impenitent? Again: in Zechariah xiii. 7, I read, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: SMITE the shepherd," etc. The word here translated "smite" (נָכָה Hiph.) is one of the strongest words used in the Old Testament to denote penal infliction. It is used again and again of the plagues

* "Which things also we speak, not in the words that man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth"—*λογοις διδακτοις πνευματος ἁγιου.* (1 Cor. ii. 13).

Digitized by Google

inflicted by Moses and Aaron on the land of Egypt; also of the destructive judgments inflicted on Edom, Amalek, and the nations of Canaan; also of the judgments threatened to Israel if disobedient (see Lev. xxvi. 24), where it is translated *punish*—"I will *punish* you yet seven times." This word, so emphatically judicial and penal, is the word used with reference to the holy Shepherd of Israel when smitten by that sword which Jehovah called on to awake against Him.

The fifty-third of Isaiah abounds with similar expressions. Thus in verse 5 we read that "He was *wounded* [*margin*, tormented] for our transgressions;" and "He was bruised for our iniquities." The word חלל, translated "wound," means to *pierce* or *penetrate* as with a sword, hence *to wound unto death.* Compare Isaiah li. 9, where the same word is used: "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; . . . . Art thou not it that hath cut Rahab, and *wounded* the dragon?" See also Ezek. xxviii. 9: "But thou shalt be a man, and no God, in the hand of him that *slayeth* thee." Nothing can be more marked than the penal, punitive, character of the action expressed by this word.

The word translated "bruise" (דכא) is, perhaps, still more expressive. The verb דָּכָא and its cognate דָּקַק (see Gesenius) means to *crush.* It is frequently used to indicate "crushing" in indignation and wrath, as when Moses ground the golden calf *till he brought it to powder.* In this

Digitized by Google

sense it is applied to the breaking in pieces of the great Gentile Image; and in 2 Sam. xxii. 23, to the crushing of the nations by the power of Christ in the great day of visitation: "*I did stamp them* like the mire in the streets."

In the 10th verse of Isaiah liii. it is again used: "It pleased Jehovah to bruise [crush] Him." And the reason of the crushing is given in the same verse, namely, that His soul was being made "an offering for sin."

See also the 22nd Psalm—that Psalm which may be regarded peculiarly as the Psalm of the Cross:—

> "I am poured out like water,
> "And all my bones are out of joint:
> "My heart is like wax;
> "It is melted in the midst of my bowels.
> "My strength is dried up like a potsherd;
> "And my tongue cleaveth to my jaws.
> "And THOU hast brought me into the dust of death."

I can understand these and like words in the Psalms when I remember that Christ was bearing the "curse" of God's holy Law in the stead of His believing people; but such words would be utterly inexplicable on any other principle. To say that Christ was not penally stricken, is to say that He did not become a Surety at all; for if He became a Surety for me, He *must* take on Himself my punishableness.

On this point no more need be said. It is beyond question that the Scripture does apply the same

Digitized by Google

penal words to our holy Substitute as it uses of personal transgressors. The New England School refuse to do this in saying "that it is of the essence of *penalty* that it be inflicted on the sinner in person."

We see therefore the ground on which the word "punishment" is rejected. Its rejection involves an abandonment of the Scripture, and the adoption of a dogma of Socinianism. The abandonment of the word "punishment" on such grounds as these is virtual abandonment of Christ's Suretyship. Indeed Fiske hesitates not to say, "that God's justice can no more be satisfied by the vicarious suffering of another than the sinful agent, than a man's thirst can be slaked by another man's vicariously drinking water for him." If that be so, Christianity perishes.

Under these circumstances is it not our bounden duty to contend for the use of the word "punishment," and to fight for it to the last? They who abandon it may not enter the camp of the foe, but they "oscillate." They do not stand firm. They do not pitch their tents within the camp of Truth. They rather form a camp for themselves, apart from the camp of Truth, and in proximity to the camp of the foe.

If I say that my Surety did not suffer penalties for me, He could not have suffered the curse of the Law for me, for that curse involved penalty and punishment. If He did not suffer the Law's curse

Digitized by Google

for me, what is before me? The certainty of suffering it myself. I submit to Mr. Cook that he is bound to alter, or withdraw, his definition of "punishment" and his definition of Atonement, if he believes the statements of Dr. Hodge to be true.

If Mr. Cook acknowledges that Christ, as the Substitute of His believing people, was "made a curse," in the sense of receiving under the hand of God the curse of His Law, he must consent to abandon the New England dogma, and with it, his own definition of punishment; for no one could receive judicially inflicted curse without receiving judicially inflicted punishment. If, on the other hand, he refuses to resign his definition, he must cease to say that Christ bore the curse of the Law. He must not (to use the expression of Dr. Hodge) "oscillate." He must not one moment say, with the Unitarians, that Christ was not judicially and penally stricken, and the next moment say that He was. If anyone feels a difficulty in explaining how the claims of retributive justice are satisfied by a substitute bearing the penalty instead of the transgressor, it is sufficient to say that God considers the claims of justice to have been adequately met; and it pertains to Him alone to determine the principles of His own government.

One of the great principles of the family of faith is, that they believe what they believe simply on the authority of God. They do not expect that the truths of revelation should be unattended with

Digitized by Google

difficulties. They receive them with their difficulties, knowing that they who are permitted at present to know only "in part" can never know anything perfectly. The Scripture is to them a repository of axioms, for which they demand no proof, further than that which is furnished by the fact that they are written by God. Mr. Cook is not satisfied with this. He has not only four Testaments, but he has also "four tests of truth":—"Intuition, instinct, experiment in the large range, and syllogism." (P. 16.) He says, "Let us keep all creeds out of our minds as much as possible, and seek, first, midst, last, all that intuition, instinct, experiment, and syllogism can teach us, or perfect loyalty to the scientific method." (P. 136.) God teaches otherwise. He does not say that any natural (ψυχικαι) powers can either search out, or apprehend, or test any spiritual truth. "The natural man (ψυχικος ἀνθρωπος) receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. ii. 14.) But Mr. Cook's book draws no such distinction between the τα ψυχικα and τα πνευματικα. We cannot receive the statements of 1 Corinthians ii. and at the same time those of his book: one or the other must be cancelled.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI.

REMARKS OF DR. HODGE.

IT is evident from what has been stated in the preceding chapter that the New England School and Mr. Cook not only concur in rejecting the word "*punishment*," as applied to Christ, but (what is still worse) concur also in their reasons for rejecting it. The New England School say, "*that it is of the essence of penalty that it be inflicted on the sinner in person;*" and Mr. Cook re-echoes the sentiment in saying, "*What is the definition of punishment? Pain inflicted for personal blameworthiness.*" Either of these statements, if true, would preclude the possibility of the curse of the Law being inflicted on our Holy Surety: for the curse of the Law must be "penal:" it must be "punishment." "The Law worketh *wrath*."

Mr. Cook, after having given this definition of punishment, proceeds to substitute chastisement in its room. Now, if by chastisement as applied to Christ was meant *penal* chastisement, that is to say, sufferings resulting from the judicial infliction of the *penalties* of the Divine Law, there would be slight objection to the exchange of "punishment" for

Digitized by Google

"chastisement," though "punishment" is unquestionably the preferable word.*

But so to use it would not suit the purpose of

* Chastisement, as used in English is, to say the least, an ambiguous expression. "Chastisement," says Johnson, "is commonly, though not always, used of domestic or parental punishment." "Chastisements," says Dr. Hodge, "are sufferings viewed as designed for the improvement of those who experience them. When viewed as designed to satisfy the claims of justice and law, they are Penal Evils. The sufferings of Christ were not mere objectless, characterless calamities. They could not have been chastisements designed for His personal improvement. They must therefore have been penal inflictions vicariously endured."—(Hodge *On the Atonement*, p. 36.)

And again: "Christ's offering of Himself as a sin-offering is declared to have been equivalent to His making Himself a ransom for us, and to His bearing the curse of the law in our stead; and that the design and effect of this ransom-paying, curse-bearing sacrifice of His is, that He redeems us from the curse of the law. It is not any kind of a sacrifice, but a ransom-paying, curse-bearing sacrifice."—(Hodge, *ibid.*)

These extracts clearly show how resolutely Dr. Hodge would refuse to surrender the word "punishment" on the ground proposed by Mr. Cook and the New England School. Mr. Cook is greatly mistaken in supposing that his views coincide with those of Dr. Hodge. They vastly differ.

The strength of the word מוּסָר translated "*chastisement*" in Isaiah liii. 5, may be seen from its use in Deut. xi. 2—the first place in which it occurs. It is there applied to the plagues on Egypt; the overthrow of the host of Pharaoh in the Red Sea; the destruction of Korah and Abiram, and the like. Nothing can more distinctly mark the fearfully penal character of this word.

Digitized by Google

those who wish to conciliate the Unitarians. The Unitarians would as much object to their saying, "Christ was penally chastised," as they would to their saying, "Christ was punished." The word "chastisement," therefore, is used to exclude the thought of penalty. Accordingly, Mr. Cook contrasts *punishment* and *chastisement*, and defines chastisement thus:—

"Pain suffered for the improvement of the one who suffers it, or for the benefit of those who witness it." (P. 120.)

If we accept this definition we must say, "Christ, although innocent, suffered pain for the benefit of those who witnessed it." I suppose few Unitarians would object to that definition.

Furthermore, when defining Atonement, Mr. Cook says:—

"Atonement is the substitution of the voluntary sacrificial chastisement of Christ for man's punishment." (P. 119.)

If we embody in this proposition Mr. Cook's definition of chastisement, it would read thus: Atonement is the substitution of Christ's voluntary sacrificial suffering of pain for the benefit of those who witness it.

I think Dean Stanley himself would see little that he would object to in that definition. If Unitarians are supposed to be benefited by being brought to accept such a definition of Atonement as that, I cannot see in what the benefit consists.

Digitized by Google

I hope to refer to this subject again. In the meanwhile, I will conclude this chapter with some extracts from Dr. Hodge's most valuable work on the Atonement.

"The Governmental Theory, however its principles may be disguised by vague and general statements, essentially involves the assumption; (1.) That justice is only a mode of benevolence; (2.) That the penalty was not executed on Christ; that His sufferings were not necessary to satisfy the rigour of divine justice; that, on the contrary, He suffered a substitute for the penalty, as an example of punishment, to counteract in the moral universe, by exhibiting God's determination to punish sin, the evil effects that would otherwise ensue upon its pardon. It is even more evident than in the case of the Socinian Theory that this view is not only partial and inverted, putting the claims of the moral universe before those of God, but absurd, also, when detached from the central idea of expiation, which it was invented to supersede. For how can His sufferings be an example of punishment unless Christ really suffered the penalty of the law? How can they demonstrate God's determination to punish sin unless sin was in very deed punished therein?" (P. 27.)

"Barnes also insists that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law; that sin was not truly punished nor punitive justice truly exercised in His death. "That the Atonement is something substituted in

the place of the penalty of the law, which will answer the same ends that the punishment of the offender himself would.' But his own definition of the penalty is, pain inflicted with the design of showing the evil of violating the law; and now he says that the Atonement is pain inflicted with the same design; and yet in making the Atonement, Christ did not suffer the penalty. Thus God manifested His justice by refusing to exercise it, and gave an example of punishment when there was no penalty; and proved His hatred of sin, and the certainty that under His Government sin shall be punished, by not punishing it either in the person of the sinner or of his Substitute."

"The advocates of the Governmental Theory of the Atonement maintain that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, but a substitute for the penalty: that His sufferings, *in some way* or *other*, avail to secure the same ends that the actual infliction of the penalty on the transgressors in person would have done. These parties agree in maintaining that it is essential to the penalty, (*a*) that it should, in each case, consist in some precise, definite kind and degree of suffering; and (*b*) that it should be inflicted on the wrong-doer in person." (P. 60.)

"The advocates of the Governmental Theory deny that the sacrifice of Christ is a *pœna vicaria*. They say it is a substitute for a penalty—something in the place of the penalty to effect the same purpose. But (*a*) *how* can anything that is not of the nature

Digitized by Google

of penalty effect the same purpose as penalty? And (*b*) *how* can the sufferings of one person sustain any relation to the sins of another person if the legal relations and responsibilities of the two persons are not identical? Suffering has relation to sin or it has not. If it has relation to sin, it must either be designed as chastisement or as a penalty. The sufferings of Christ had relation to sin, and they were not personal chastisement; they must, therefore, have been penalty—of the genus penalty and of the species vicarious penalty. If this be denied, let some one state definitely *what* they were, and let it be shown precisely how His suffering (which by hypothesis is not penalty) takes the place and secures the end of the literal punishment of persons whose identical legal obligations do not rest upon the person suffering. How, in the name of reason, is it possible that the undeserved sufferings of Christ, which were not the penalty which the law demanded, should make it consistent with God's rectoral justice to relax the law, and omit the penalty altogether in the case of repentant sinners? If God's abhorrence of sin is really and adequately expressed in the sufferings of Christ, how is it that His distributive justice is not strictly satisfied therein? and how could He truly and really express His abhorrence of our sins by means of the sufferings of Christ, unless the real legal responsibility for our sins were first laid upon Christ, and they were then strictly punished in Him?" (P. 308.)

Digitized by Google

"As God hates sin because of its intrinsic hatefulness, having in itself the reason of the hatred it excites, so He punishes it because of its intrinsic demerit, having the reason of its punishment in itself. Sin can no more exist without punishableness than it can exist without hatefulness. As it is inconceivable that God should in a single instance fail to hate sin as pollution, so it is inconceivable that He should in a single instance fail to punish it as demerit. There has often been forgiveness for the sinner, but not a single instance of forgiveness for the sin; and the sinner is never forgiven except on condition of the condign punishment of the sin." (P. 50.)

"The *penalty* is an essential element of the law. There can exist no law, or authoritative rule of conduct for voluntary and morally accountable agents, to which a penal sanction is not attached; and the reason of the penalty is just as intrinsic and immutable as the reason of the precept. As we have seen that the reason of the precept is the intrinsic rightness of the thing commanded, so the reason of the penalty is the intrinsic demerit of the thing forbidden. As the chief end of the precept is the glory of God, that is, the manifestation of His excellence through the exercise of His attributes as they are concerned in commanding: so the chief end of the penalty is His glory through the exercise of His attributes as they are concerned in punishing. As the moral principle involved in every precept can-

Digitized by Google

not be compromised, so the Divine judgment of the ill-desert of sin involved in all penalty cannot be relaxed. The precept and the penalty alike express the infallible judgment of the Divine intelligence, on a question of moral obligation founded on the Divine nature."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VII.

ATONEMENT BRIEFLY CONSIDERED.

I HAVE thought it desirable to interpose in this place a chapter giving what I believe to be the true doctrine of the Atonement as taught in Scripture. It is but a sketch; but is, I trust, sufficiently clear.

Of all the subjects to which our thoughts can be directed, there is none more important than that of Atonement. It is the very key-stone of our hopes. Blessed for ever are they for whom Atonement has been made and accepted. It has been made and accepted for all the family of faith.

ATONEMENT is a priestly work of the Lord Jesus directed towards God, whereby, by one offering once made, He has satisfied for His believing people, all the claims of the Divine holiness, and procured for them not only pardon, but acceptance and eternal life in glory.

Naturally we stand:—

Under the guilt arising from Adam's first sin imputed.

Under the guilt arising from a corrupted moral nature.

Digitized by Google

Under the guilt arising from our sins of ignorance and wilful transgressions.

Under the guilt arising from our want of perfect devotedness to God.

The Law was given to declare the righteous claims of God, and to make manifest the extent and character of our sinfulness. The great mandatory precept of the Law is, "Thou shalt love God perfectly, and manifest that love perfectly and always."

The great prohibitory commandment is, "Thou shalt not be concupiscent" (*οὐκ επιθυμησεις*), that is "Thou shalt not desire anything that is evil."

The Law promised blessing and eternal life to those who should keep it; but pronounced curse and eternal judgment on those who violated it even once: even if it were violated only in thought:—"Cursed is he that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them;" "The thought of foolishness is sin."

From Mount Gerizim was pronounced the blessing: from Mount Ebal the curse. Naturally we stand before Ebal, and never could move thence. We never could approach Gerizim.

The Law requires:—

1. The absence of all wilful transgression
2. The absence of sins of ignorance.
3. Perfectness in the inner man.
4. Perfectness of developed character.
5. Perfect and unreserved devotedness to God.

The Law cannot remit or lower its claims. Its

Digitized by Google

claims are founded on the essential holiness of God. The Law has been promulgated, and must be fulfilled in every jot and tittle. "Verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot, or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled."

All this shuts us up into hopelessness, and leaves us heirs of wrath for ever. "The Law worketh wrath." "If there could have been a law which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the Law; but the Scripture hath concluded all under sin."

But God has been pleased to declare that He admits the principle of substitutional service.

Further He announces that He has appointed a Substitute or Sponsor (ἔγγυος) for all the family of faith.

Christ voluntarily submitted to be that Sponsor. He formally undertook the responsibilities of all those who come in faith to Him, and engaged to do everything, and to bear everything that was necessary Godward, in order to bring them unto eternal life in glory. His appointment to this Suretyship was founded on the Justice of God, which required that there should be no sin that was not punished; and was founded on the love of God which determined to bring those who were delivered from punishment, unto life and glory above the heavens. It was necessary, therefore, that He should in our stead meet every requirement of God's Law that

Digitized by Google

demanded perfect service and obedience, and likewise that He should meet the appointed penalties that came upon Him because of our disobedience: for we owe unto God a double debt:—a debt of obedience; and, because of failure in that, a debt of penal suffering.

Accordingly, after having as our Sponsor, and in our stead, fulfilled "all righteousness" and glorified God perfectly in life, He glorified Him also in death. He gave Himself up to be led as a lamb to the slaughter. He brought up *our* sins (not His own, for He had none) in His own body to the tree for judgment, and there they received judgment from the hand of God, as it is written, "a curse of God is he that hangeth on a tree." There the hand of man in all its power was put forth against Him: there the hand of Satan in all its power was put forth against Him: there it "pleased Jehovah to bruise Him and to put Him to grief," and so "His soul was made an offering for sin."

But at the same moment that He bore the curse of God's violated Law in our stead, He also presented to God for us His own essential inseparable perfectness. He was made a curse for us (Gal. iii. 13); but He also gave Himself for us an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. The word שְׂרֵפָה, to burn up in the devouring flame, and קְטֹרֶת, to burn for fragrance on the altar, alike found their accomplishment in Him. His direst suffering was but the result of His perfect obedience

Digitized by Google

unto God: therefore God delighted in Him whilst for our sake He was bruising Him, for He saw in Him the Son of His bosom fulfilling His will in glorifying His justice, and enabling Him to manifest His love. You may bruise frankincense and burn it, but the more you bruise and burn it, the more you find excellency of fragrance to be the result. The frankincense has been burned: its fragrance ascended up before God: and it covers with its preciousness the feeblest believer for ever.

Christ on the Cross was a Priest as well as a Sacrifice. All the words applied to Him as the Offerer in Hebrews ix. and x. are priestly. Every High Priest must be able to bear on his forehead, "HOLINESS UNTO JEHOVAH." Such ever was Christ, even when our Sin-bearer.

And as no one but Himself was suited to be a sacrifice, so no one but Himself could be a Priest competent to offer. It needed One who had perfect understanding of and perfect fellowship with the holiness of God, and this no creature hath: it needed also One who understood and appreciated the nature of sin and the infinitude of man's moral distance and alienation from God. Without such knowledge He could not have spoken worthily, or offered meetly. But He had that knowledge, for He was "Jehovah's fellow."

That which He had to do and to suffer as the Sponsor was determined by the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, before the world was. God

Digitized by Google

only knows, and He only can appoint that which is necessary to meet the claims of His Justice, and the requirements of His holiness. All things that were then appointed, whether little or whether great, were, when appointed, alike necessary to fulfil the work which the Sponsor undertook to accomplish.

His work in making Atonement was God-ward. All atonement has God for its object. The Priest in atoning had his face turned toward God. JUSTICE had to be satisfied; and in order to satisfy JUSTICE, wrath must be appeased by the required penalties being borne, and by the required perfectness being presented. "Go quickly unto the congregation [said Moses to Aaron], and make an atonement for them: for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun. And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation; and behold, the plague was begun among the people: and he put on incense, and made an atonement for the people. And he stood between the dead and the living; and the plague was stayed." (Numbers xvi. 46.)

These words should ever be present to our minds when we think or speak of Atonement. The expressions used both in the Old Testament and in the New to denote Atonement, distinctly indicate offering made to God to appease wrath.

Our Surety's service was voluntary, and therefore meritorious. It was the service not of a creature, but of Immanuel: therefore it was infinitely meritorious.

Digitized by Google

God only could estimate its value. According to its value, He has blessed the family of faith. They are not merely pardoned, they are not merely accepted, but accepted under the value of an infinite meritoriousness, according to which their reward is. They have, therefore, a rewardableness according to the merits of their Sponsor. Their title is founded exclusively on that which their Surety has wrought in their stead. Such is the necessary result of the *legal oneness* with Him which God has granted them.

In fulfilment of His purpose to reward, God has appointed that Christ should, as the Second Man, the last Adam, be their Head, and that they should have living union with Him through the Spirit. This union is granted to them the moment they enter the fold of faith. They are one with Him in glory: and will in due time be changed into His likeness, and so will reign with Him in life. For this they wait. In the meanwhile, they are delivered from their natural condition of servitude to Sin. Sin is no longer their master, though it struggles to regain its *mastership*: but it never can, for they are transferred into another service—the service of God. And in order that they may serve God, the new man is created in them, and the Holy Ghost is sent to strengthen that new man, so that sure results, more or less developed, are produced, not dependent on the fickle and unstable will of the creature, but wrought by the faithful and effectual power of God.

These, and many more like things, are the insepar-

Digitized by Google

able concomitants of pardon. None who are unpardoned have them, but the pardoned have them, and that inalienably for ever. The results, therefore, of being protected by Atonement are not contingent and doubtful, but fixed and certain. Sure blessings are received, though the degrees of developments vary. All who are brought under Atonement (and the feeblest believer is) are brought into a new relation to God. They stand upon a new platform. Naturally death, the result of judgment unto condemnation, reigns over us: when brought under Atonement, grace reigns over us unto eternal life. This is a radical change of relation to the government of God.

To this the Gospel seeketh to bring. God "preacheth peace by Jesus Christ." Christ saith, "I am the door." "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athrist come. And WHOSOEVER will, let him take the water of life freely."

The family of faith as atoned for, stand within the fold, and point to the one "door" by which they have entered, and beseech others who are yet without to enter by that same "door," and to share their safety and blessedness—a blessedness of which they are able to explain the ground, and to declare the results.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII.

MR. COOK'S ILLUSTRATION OF THE ATONEMENT.

THE master of a certain school in America is said by Mr. Cook to have enacted that if any of his scholars should offend, the transgressor should not be "punished," but that he, the master, should be "chastised" instead.

By this arrangement "punishment" was for ever banished from the school. No transgressor could be punished. Indeed, no one could be punished, for the master was not "punished," but "chastised."

A boy transgressed. He was directed by the master to chastise him—the master. The boy obeyed so far as to give one stroke. Thus the honour of the law of the school was upheld. The boy was reformed, and the whole school edified. Whether abidingly or not does not appear.

If such a mode of government were right in a school, it would be right in a kingdom.* All punish-

* I should not have said this, unless Mr. Cook had elsewhere used (see next chapter) an illustration in which a *King* is supposed to deal with a *Deserter* in the same way as the master with the scholar.

Digitized by Google

ment would be abolished. Magistrates and judges would enforce no penalties on transgressors, but would substitute their own voluntary chastisement for the penalties which Justice should have inflicted. Moved by the sight of such disinterested magnanimity, criminals would be reformed, and society at large be restrained from transgression. Who could doubt it? Only those who have some knowledge of what the heart of man is. They would remember the tale of the husbandman who nursed the frozen viper in his bosom, and was bitten as soon as it revived.

Mr. Cook, however, does not think the heart of man to be viperous. He thinks that man has a "susceptibility of oneness with God in conscience," and that he is "susceptible of sinlessness." (P. 154.) He thinks that Christ, as the true light, is in all men. (P. 51.)

To what extent Mr. Cook would wish to apply his illustration to the Divine Methods of Atonement I am not prepared to say. He admits that the definition is imperfect. His words are:—

"The illustration is, of course, imperfect on many points; but on a few it is serviceable, and I present it only to throw light on these. It is perfectly clear that the pupil by his own act made himself liable to suffer in order to preserve the honour of the law he violated. If that liableness was to be removed, it was necessary something should be done; and the school would have gone to ruin if nothing had been done to preserve the honour of its law. I understand perfectly too, that, when this boy goes back, a motive has been brought to bear on him that will transform him, if anything can.

Digitized by Google

Nothing can take hold of human nature like such condescension, justice, and love." (P. 122.)

Mr. Cook evidently attaches considerable importance to the illustration, for he says on page 121 :—

"In the arc of that little example are involved principles that sweep the whole curve of the Atonement, or show in part how God's chastisement was substituted for our punishment."*

Yet even as regards the point which this incident is especially intended to illustrate, it fails. Mr. Cook says, the transgressing pupil was "liable to suffer in order to preserve the honour of the law he violated." This is not the way in which the Scripture teaches us to regard the punishment of those who know the pains of "the second death." They suffer because Divine Justice requires they should be retributively dealt with *in wrath*. So only can the honour of the Divine Law be maintained. The

* For further remarks on this subject see succeeding chapter. Mr. Cook says, indeed, that the master "would never have adopted this measure except with the sensitive." But then we must remember that Mr. Cook holds with the Neo-Platonists that there is a Divine principle in every man. He calls conscience, God. No heart in which God and Christ dwell can be otherwise than sensitive.

"The Neo-Platonists" (says Kingsley) said "that there is a Divine element in man. The Christian philosophers assented fervently, and raised the old disagreeable question 'Is it in every man? In the publicans and harlots, as well as the philosophers? We say that it is.' And there, again, the Neo-Platonist finds it ever hard to assent. * * * * For the herd, Plotinus cannot say that there is anything Divine in them."—(Kingsley, as quoted by Dr. Rigg, p. 238.)

Digitized by Google

action of *Justice* towards sin must take effect. Its action must be one of wrath, whether sin be visited on the sinner, or on the Holy Sin-bearer. The illustration (in conformity with the New England principle already referred to) rejects this. Mr. Cook allows that in the example cited Justice is not satisfied. His words on page 131 are, "*Because Justice is satisfied? No.*"

Christ would never have experienced that which is taught by the word שָׂרַף,* as used in Leviticus xvi. 27, nor have borne THE CURSE OF THE LAW, except to maintain the glory of God by satisfying the claims of retributive Justice. Every sinner that enters heaven is regarded as having passed through wrath, in the person of his Substitute. There is no substitution of chastisement, or of anything else, for *penalty*, but by the Substitute penalty is veritably borne. The heart of man is ever ready to ask a thousand questions on these and other like things. But God will not answer them now. At present we know only "in part." We believe what God has revealed, because *He* has revealed it; not because we understand the things revealed.

* The word שָׂרַף means *to burn up in consuming fire;* whereas קָטַר means *to burn for fragrance.* The latter word is always applied to offerings *burnt for a sweet savour on the altar:* the latter is used of those parts of the sin-offering that were *burned up* without the gate. *The fat* of the sin-offering, however, was burned for a sweet savour on the altar, and then קטר is used.

Digitized by Google

We have no more ability to comprehend fully the nature, extent, and legal value of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus under the hand of God, than we have power to create the universe. It pertains to God, not to us, to estimate those sufferings in relation to the satisfaction of His justice.* The words ἱλασκεσθαι, and כִּפֶּר, founded on כִּפֶּר פָּנִים of Genesis xxxii. 20, are sufficient to prove that the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus was intended to APPEASE wrath, and did *appease* wrath; and wrath is the result of retributive Justice. The law is honoured; but not by the claims of retributive Justice being set aside.

We do not then complain because the illustration is imperfect, but because it is misleading. Is the relation in which the master stands towards his school analogous to that which God holds towards a world of lost sinners? The scholars quietly pro-

* The Divine holiness requires that sin, wherever found, whether the demerit be imputed or whether it be personal, should be visited by *wrath*. Christ, when He voluntarily undertook to be the Surety of His believing people, became legally answerable for their sins, and consequently became subject to wrath. The appointments of God are founded on the requirements of His own holiness: and He alone can determine what is necessary to satisfy those requirements. He has revealed that when THE Substitute by Him appointed, One who was His "fellow," underwent, in the stead of all those who had legal oneness with Him, the veritable inflictions of Divine wrath,—the claims of retributive Justice against those for whom He suffered (*i.e.*, the whole family of faith) were fully satisfied. One thing is certain, that they who have not met wrath substitutionally, must meet it personally.

Digitized by Google

gressing in their school cannot be regarded as fit representatives of sinners who are under God's curse as "children of wrath." The scholars are not supposed to be under a fiery Law which they had broken, and were ever continuing to break, a Law not changeable like the master's rules, but founded on the principles of God's essential holiness—a Law which required not only that its incurred penalties should be met, but that its demand for perfect obedience should be answered also. Moreover, God never quits the place of supreme authority as the master did. On the contrary, He retains it as One who rules in righteousness, demanding the service that is due, and remitting no penalty. So far from submitting to the stroke of chastisement, He calls on the sword to awake against the man that is His fellow. Satisfaction to Justice is demanded and rendered by a duly approved and recognised Surety. In the illustration all these things are wanting. There is no Ruler who retains his place of authority, and requires penalties from another; no Surety; no satisfaction to Justice.

In the methods of God, the satisfaction made by the Surety brings to all those who are under that Suretyship, sure and everlasting blessings. All who have Christ for their Surety are brought into a new relation to God and to His government; and from that change of relation blessings sure and everlasting flow. The meritoriousness of their Surety rests upon them. Life is given unto them in Him. The

Digitized by Google

Law is written upon their hearts. Though justified as ungodly, the Spirit is given to them as the Paraclete that they may love and serve God as dear children. They are not left in the kingdom of darkness, but translated into the kingdom of the Son of God's love. But in the case of the scholars there is no such change of condition. Though supposed to be freed for ever from liability to punishment, no actual *moral* change is wrought in them. A moral change is *hoped* for: that is all. All who are acquainted with the true condition of the human heart surely know that the hoped for change under such influences will never come. Thus they who are confessedly unrepentant and hardened are placed under a shelter that protects them from punishment for ever, without any security for their repentance or amendment.

If the illustration stood alone it might be passed over without remark. But it does not stand alone. It must be looked at in connection with certain definitions and statements that are found in other parts of Mr. Cook's book. We have to consider it in connection with these statements and definitions in order to ascertain the end towards which Mr. Cook's system of doctrine tends.

Mr. Cook's definition of Atonement is, "*The substitution of the voluntary sacrificial chastisement of Christ for man's punishment.*"

If we connect this definition with the illustration, we must infer that as the rule appointing the

Digitized by Google

master's chastisement freed the scholars abidingly from all liability to punishment, so the voluntary sacrificial chastisement of Christ has freed all men from all liability to punishment. Hence it follows that no penal inflictions from the hand of God can fall on any, either in this world, or in the next.

There are passages in Mr. Cook's writings in which he speaks of Heaven as a locality; and yet we find him writing thus, when speaking of a murderer:—

"Perhaps he thought heaven was a place rather than a state. Confucius said on the Yellow Sea, 'Heaven means principle.'" (P. 107.)

On page 27, we read:—

"What is the definition of perdition? Permanent dissimilarity of feeling with God. That definition does not imply that a man has lost all tendency to respect what is reasonable, but that he never attains predominant love of what God loves. The failure to attain predominant love of what God loves and hate of what God hates is perdition."

I scarcely need say that the Scripture never speaks of Heaven as being "a *state*," or "*principle*"; and that "perdition" does not denote a state of moral distance from God merely, but a condition of "torment" in "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." The Scripture further states that they whose names shall not be found "written in the book of life," shall be "cast into the lake of fire." (Rev. xx. 15.) If, however, the conclusion to which Mr. Cook's illustration points, be

adopted, none can be cast into the lake of fire; for no penal inflictions are to fall on any. Christ's "*chastisement*" being substituted for man's "*punishment*," frees all men from *punishment*, though it does not save all men from "perdition," which is a condition which men voluntarily bring upon themselves. God, it is said, has placed all men in a condition in which the moral influence, arising from the consideration of the pain suffered by Christ "for the benefit of those who witnessed it," may justly be expected to give "immeasureable motives to loyalty." (P. 123.) "This substitution," says Mr. Cook, "of voluntary sacrificial chastisement for punishment, is the force which throws the shuttles that weave a new character in the soul thus delivered from punishment." (P. 126.)

"The failure," says Mr. Cook, "to attain predominant love of what God loves and hate of what God hates is perdition." (P. 27.) Consequently, the converse of this, that is to say, success in attaining predominant love of what God loves, and hate of what God hates, must be salvation. Now on what does Mr. Cook rely as the instrumental power that is to bring man into this permanent love of God? What was it that affected, measurably at least, the schoolboy's mind? The seeing his master's chastisement substituted for his punishment; so he and all the other scholars, in accordance with the law that enacted the master's chastisement, enjoyed a perpetual immunity from punishment. In like manner,

Digitized by Google

the knowledge that Christ's chastisement has been substituted for man's punishment, is "the force that throws the shuttles that weave a new character" in men's souls. Atonement, therefore, does not in itself bring salvation to any, though it brings pardon to all. The deliverance from a condition of perdition, and the bringing into one of salvation, depends upon the effect produced upon the soul by the knowledge of the fact of our being pardoned, and our grateful recognition of the means by which that pardon is secured. Erskine's doctrine of universal pardon was not more dangerous than this. Erskine taught that pardon had been procured for all men, as regarded all their transgressions; and that none will be punished except for unbelief. We need only to quote one text to crush that statement. The apostle after enumerating certain transgressions, says, "*For which things' sake* the wrath of God cometh on all the children of disobedience." (Col. iii. 6.) The same text nullifies the statement that perdition is a state of moral opposedness to God merely, and not one of inflicted penalty. "The wrath of God cometh," are words which express with sufficient clearness the infliction of penalty.

According to Mr. Cook's system (as I have already said) atonement brings immunity from wrath to all men; yet *possibly* none may attain salvation. Failure, however, is deemed unlikely. If the shuttles that weave a new character in the soul go on working aright, the final result would be the attainment of a

Digitized by Google

condition of perfectness. According to Mr. Cook men are not indisposed to yield to this force.

"Man has a susceptibility of oneness with God in conscience." (P. 154.)

"Conscience is that divine Somewhat or Some One who is revealed in the moral law and is in us, but not of us." (P. 50.)

"Man is susceptible of sinlessness." (P. 154.)

"One test of perfectness in a religion, is its power to bring out man into sinlessness, and its power to do that must be tested by what it has done." (P. 157.)

"The possibilities of human nature are exhibited in the human nature of our Lord. Any religion that is without such a sinless character is defective in its exhibition of the capabilities of man, and cannot, therefore, be a perfect religion." (P. 156.)

Am I then to judge of the capabilities of my fallen sin-possessed nature by considering the capabilities of my Lord's miraculously begotten humanity—a humanity not only perfect in itself, but also inseparably conjoined with Godhead? The Lord Jesus had not the φρονημα σαρκος; but I have: and that φρονημα σαρκος "is not subject to the Law of God, *neither indeed can be.*" If there be inseparably attached to my present condition of being something that is "*enmity* against God," and *cannot* be subjected to the Law of God, it is idle to speak of my being in a condition that is susceptible of sinlessness. I must cease to bear the

Digitized by Google

image of the earthy Adam, and be made to bear the image of the heavenly before I can have and develop the powers of a sinless life like that of my Lord. It is not true, therefore, that the possibilities of our sin-possessed humanity are exhibited in the miraculously generated humanity of our Lord. Nor, while we remain in the flesh, are we susceptible of sinlessness: nor do we ever *here* attain to sinlessness. We shall be satisfied when we awake up in His likeness—not before. I do not follow Mr. Cook's "Oldest Testament": I follow my written Testament, and that tells me that "in many things we all offend." It is very certain that James, who wrote these words, did not think himself susceptible of sinlessness. It is very certain that when he considered the sinless humanity of the Holy One of God, he did not regard it as indicating the capabilities of his fallen, sin-possessed humanity.

On page 20, Mr. Cook writes as follows:—

"It is scientifically incontrovertible, that the past cannot be changed; and therefore it is sure that, if regret for what ought not to have been is pain, there will be pain in the universe for ever."

"This planet moves through space enswathed with light. The radiance of the sun billows away to all quarters of infinity Behind the globe a shadow is projecting; diminishing, indeed lost at last in the immeasurable vast of the illuminations of the scene. The stars sing there; the suns are all glad. No doubt, if Richter was right in saying that the interstellar spaces are the homes of souls, there is unfathomable bliss in all these pulsating, unfathomable spaces, so far as they are

Digitized by Google

regions of loyalty to God. There can be no blessedness without holiness, and so there cannot be bliss where loyalty does not exist. Behind every planet there will be that shadow; and as surely as there cannot be illumination on one side without shadow on the other, so surely a record of sin will cast a shadow for ever, and some part of that shadow will sweep over the sea of glass, and not be invisible from the Great White Throne."

I make no remark on the assertions, or language, or illustrations of this extraordinary passage,* except to say, that the illustration would seem to show that wherever there is light there must be shadow, which, however, true in earth is untrue in Heaven, where all is "transparent crystal;" secondly, the illustration seems to contradict the conclusion which Mr. Cook seeks to establish, for the illustration, speaks of a shadow that terminates, whereas the shadow cast on the sea of glass is said by him to abide for ever. Mr. Cook will say that I am a "blunderer," and too dull to be instructed. Certainly I do think that if that which he says be true, if the redeemed are to be followed by a record of their past sin so as for that to "cast a shadow for ever" around them, and that "some part of that shadow will sweep over the sea of glass, and not be invisible from the Great White Throne," if this be so, we should be obliged to say,

* I would, however, say, that it seems a daring act of impiety to speak of the "interstellar spaces" being the homes of souls, when it is positively revealed that the souls of the saved depart to be with Christ in the Paradise of God.

Digitized by Google

that none will be *perfectly* happy in heaven, except those who have died in infancy without committing any sin. In the case of all others, every wrong desire, every idle or foolish thought, every failure in devotedness, every blemish in character, every sin of ignorance, every committed trespass, heinous or otherwise, everything in which we have fallen short of God's glory in thought, or word, or deed, will all envelop the redeemed in Heaven with remembrances that will for ever throw a darkening shadow around them, and bring darkness into a scene where previously there was only light. And inasmuch as sin will be estimated then not according to our present deadened powers of apprehension, but according to that new, deep, intensified power of appreciation that must attach to all who "bear the image of the heavenly," it is evident that an abiding consciousness of past evil, and the effect that may have been thereby produced on others, would cause, to some more especially, an abiding poignancy of sorrow which remorse would be a word too feeble to express. A murderer chained to the skeleton of his victim might roam at large, but he would have an embittered liberty, and if you placed him in an Eden he would groan still.

Mr. Cook speaks much about permanency of character. No doubt, according to the laws of men's natural condition of being *here*, prolonged habit *tends* to produce fixity, though even here

there may be counteracting agencies. But has God, *acting in grace and in the power of the new creation*, no ability to reverse the operation of mere natural laws, and to change the results? The Apostle Paul had great fixity of character as "a blasphemer, persecutor, and injurious." He well nigh committed the unpardonable sin. If he had done wittingly, what he did ignorantly, he would have committed it. He speaks of himself, therefore, as the chief of pardoned sinners. But in a moment, the fixity of his character was gone. The tiger became a lamb. If he had died the moment after the Lord spoke to him, he would have gone into the Paradise of God, taking with him not one feeling that was contrary to the perfectness and blessedness of Christ. The bitter remembrance of those whom he had slaughtered and caused to blaspheme, would not have followed him. He would have been able to say what Hezekiah said, "Thou hast cast all my sins behind Thy back." See also Micah vii. 19: "Thou hast cast all their sins into the depths of the sea." That which is cast into the depths of the sea disappears: it vanishes out of sight: it is seen no more for ever. The means by which God will effect the nullification of the bitterness of the past it is not for us to enquire. "His ways are not as our ways;" "With God all things are possible." The book of nature may contain no page on which *oblivion* is written: but it is otherwise in the Book

Digitized by Google

of redemption. The love that covereth the multitude of sins doth with the sins bury the resulting anguish. No shadow can ever darken any condition that God pronounces to be one of transparent crystal brightness. The crystal of the heavenly City would not be described as διαυγης if it could be dimmed or darkened by the condition of those who walk therein. The condition of those who arise in the likeness of Christ will not be less crystal than the place of their habitation. "Former things" will have "passed away." He that sitteth on the Throne will say, "Behold, I make all things NEW."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX.

MR. COOK'S ILLUSTRATION OF THE ATONEMENT.

(Continued.)

THE preceding chapter had been written before Mr. Cook's explanatory statement in his last edition of "Orthodoxy" appeared. I have not thought it necessary, in consequence of that explanation, to make any material alteration in my statements. I had observed and quoted the passage in his first edition, in which he states that the illustration is not intended to be a complete one, but that it illustrates "a few points." In consequence of his having said this, I should have passed by the illustration entirely, if he had not in connection therewith given a formal definition of atonement, and made also certain other statements respecting atonement and its results in other parts of his writings. By that definition and those remarks I have endeavoured to regulate my statements.

Nor is this the only illustration used by Mr. Cook. In his Lecture on Transcendentalism, p. 70, we read:

"A man who has been a deserter comes back to his king, and should receive a thousand stripes. His king takes a hundred in his place, and that chastisement is substituted for—

Digitized by Google

the deserter's punishment. The deserter's *demerit* remains; in the nature of things, his king could not assume that. For ever and for ever it will be true that the man has behind him the record of a deserter. Even Ommipotence cannot make what once has been not to have been. But for ever and for ever the deserter's debt to the law is paid, and its payment cannot be demanded of the deserter. *If, now, that deserter wishes motives to loyalty, what ought he to keep vividly before his thoughts?* His Lord's power, or his Lord's unspeakable condescension? His Lord as his King, or his Lord as his Redeemer? All hearts that undefstand it, this question melts in this age, as it has in every past age, and will in every future age. Let the deserter remember his own irremovable demerit; let him fill his soul with thoughts of his King as his Redeemer."

In this, as in the previous illustration, the same general features are found.

The Sovereign vacates his place as the administrator of penalty.

No legally appointed surety intervenes betwixt him and the transgressor.

Something that is not penalty is substituted for penalty.

The infliction is one-tenth less than the appointed punishment.

It frees the deserter for ever from all punishment.

No sure provision is made for his present or his future loyalty.

Even if he prove loyal, a stigma continues to attach to him.

All this agrees well with Mr. Cook's definition of the Atonement, but agrees not with Scripture.

Digitized by Google

Justification is founded on Atonement. Now, what is justification? Is it pardon merely? It might seem so from Mr. Cook's definition, and illustrations, and comments. But it is not pardon merely. Justification is a judicial act of God, pronouncing the believing sinner righteous—that is, right *(en règle)* in respect of all His holy law (mandatory, prohibitive, and penal) on the ground that those claims had been once and for ever satisfied for that believing sinner by a Substitute with whom, by God's appointment, he is *legally one*. On the ground of that legal oneness, the believing sinner is entitled to regard that Substitute as his *alter ego*, who has in his stead done that which he could not do, and suffered in his stead that which he could not suffer. This, and nothing less than this, is the result of God's grace in having provided an Atoner. God has made no provision for granting mere pardon to anyone. Those whom He pardons He justifies; and whom He justifies, them He also glorifies. What analogy, then—what illustration drawn from mere human arrangements—can properly indicate this? How can a human sovereign bestow righteousness on him whom he pardons? How can he efface past stains? How can he give a new heart and a new condition of being? We must get out of the realm of "Naturus" before we can understand anything about these things. There is no school there that teaches them.

There is no text that declares more plainly than Heb. ii. 10, that the purpose of God in redemption

Digitized by Google

was not merely to pardon, but to bring unto glory. "It became Him of whom are all things, and by whom are all things, when He brought* (*ἀγαγοντα*) many sons unto glory to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." For this cause Christ, in order that He might raise us from our condition of debasement, and misery, and sin, into a condition not of pardon *merely*, but of *sonship in glory*, comes, and (to use the expression of Scripture) "taketh hold of" us—*ἐπιλαμβανεται*. "He taketh not hold" of angels: "He taketh not hold" of mankind at large, but of "the seed of Abraham He taketh hold." The family of faith are the seed of Abraham: for "as many as are of faith the same are the children of Abraham." Of *them* He taketh hold, that He might, as the sure and certain consequence of such "taking hold," bring them as "sons unto glory." For this He stooped from His eternal glory, and abhorred not the Virgin's womb. For this He took His place in the midst of men to be the Representative, the "*alter*

* There has been much discussion about the use of the aorist *ἀγαγοντα* in this passage. It is evidently used designedly. When the Captain of our salvation had finished His course of service on the earth, and was *officially* perfected thereby, He secured to all His believing people a sure *title* to glory. Virtually, though not actually, they were brought thereunto. The words *ὑπερ παντος* in verse 9 should not be rendered "*for every man*," but "*for every one*," *i.e.*, for every one of those spoken of in the passage, viz., the sons "whom God brought unto glory."

Digitized by Google

ego" of His believing people. For them He lived: for them as the true light He shone before God. For them He glorified God in the earth: for them He passed through judicial death: for them He bore the curse: for them He presented Himself an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour. Thus the great Atoner effected His work. In no other way could it have been effected.

The work of the Atoner was directed towards God. Whatever effects might ultimately be produced on those who were atoned for, the first great object was the satisfaction of the claims of God. Sin is not merely *a disease* requiring remedial treatment or cure: it has brought on us *criminality:* it has made us amenable to *the wrath* of God. Therefore, before any remedial agencies can be employed, wrath must be appeased. There was One only who could present the required perfectness, and bear the appointed curse. He undertook the work of appeasement, and He accomplished it. The claims of justice were satisfied, and "all righteousness" fulfilled. Thus, for all who are "of faith," a new stand-place is established before God, founded exclusively on the service of Another. His service was voluntary, and therefore meritorious; and because of the dignity of His person it was infinitely meritorious. That meritoriousness becomes the endowment of His people. It gives to them a rewardableness, the infinite extent of which eternity only will unfold. No pardoned sinner can have less

Digitized by Google

than this. We have either this, or we have nothing. The blessing given in Christ cannot be disintegrated. "All fulness" is given in Him. We have it in its entirety, or we have it not at all.

It scarcely need be said that they on whose heads the meritoriousness of Christ is placed, must be infinitely precious in the sight of God. He finds them in the distance, and justifies them as ungodly: but He does not leave them to be what they were before, the servants of Satan, and the servants of corruption. They are brought under a new covenant, a covenant of grace, and in that covenant, provision is made for their holiness, and for their preservation in time and in eternity. The legal oneness which they have with Christ as God's righteous Servant, has given them an irreversible *title* to all blessing: and a part of that blessing is the bestowment of life—life in union with Christ as the Living One (ὁ ζων). This is a character of life that angels have not. It pertains to the redeemed alone. All, therefore, who are brought under the imputation of His meritoriousness are quickened, and have living union with Him through the Spirit. Their "life is hid with Christ in God." The new man is created in them. (See Eph. iv. 24 and Col. iii. 10.) The law is written upon their hearts. (Heb. viii. 10.) The Spirit as the Paraclete is sent to dwell in them. They are translated out of the kingdom of darkness, to which they before belonged, into the kingdom of the Son of God's love. (Col. i.) Sin,

Digitized by Google

though still in them, has no longer *dominion* over them. (Rom. iv.) Christ, who is their Redeemer and their Life, is also their Master, their Shepherd, their Priest, their Advocate, their Brother, their Husband, their Friend: and when the hour of His manifested glory shall come, He will give them *practical* meetness for Heaven by changing them into His own heavenly likeness. As they have borne the image of the earthy, they shall also bear the image of the heavenly. All these things are the necessary and sure results of being brought under the imputation of the meritoriousness of Immanuel. To hide or misrepresent the sure covenanted *results* of Atonement, would be as great a sin as to hide the Atonement itself.

But the results of Atonement must be confined to those who are atoned for—that is to say, the family of faith. They only are redeemed; on them only the meritoriousness of their Redeemer rests. In them "Christ the hope of glory IS." To them only it can be said, "Ye are the temple of the living God," as God said, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people." (2 Cor. vi. 16.) This may be called Divine Immanence; but it is not true of the universe; it is not true of all men: it is true of the family of faith alone. To speak of the indwelling presence of God as being in the unbelieving world, is to associate with God in holiness and in glory, those for whom is "reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." If Christ

Digitized by Google

be in all men, then all men are in Christ—all are redeemed; all quickened; all seated with Him in heavenly places. Mr. Cook speaks in one place of God being "the Father, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of *the universe.*" (P. 118.) He speaks also of God and of Christ being in all men. If he adhere to these statements in their literal meaning, the most extreme Pantheism would scarcely desire that he should go further. It is very obvious that the headships of the First man and of the Second Man, in the contrast in which they are presented to us in the Scripture, must be utterly set aside if the system of Mr. Cook be adopted. The essential and everlasting distinction between *οἱ ψυχικοι* and *οἱ πνευματικοι* must be abandoned.

The strength of the language used in the following extract, shows that Mr. Cook attaches great importance to the illustration in indicating the results of the substitution of Christ's chastisement for man's punishment.

"My friends, exact and cool science knows with precision that we want just this" [the Atonement described in the illustration] "more than unspeakably if anything like this has been done for us. We want it, first, to pay our debt to the school of the universe, in the sense, of removing liableness to suffering to preserve the honour of violated law; and, next to give us immeasurable motives to loyalty. There is surely nothing that really changes the heart so quickly as a sight of this substitution of chastisement for punishment,

Digitized by Google

whether it be in the human case of a school, or in the revealed case of the school of the universe. Lift this feeling of the poor boy into all the dignity it naturally assumes when you take it as a type of the moral law, a unit throughout the universe; lift that law until the arc we can measure has become the segment of a circle large enough to reach from here to the galaxies; and then let all the constellations shine on the circle as you carry its line far past the spot over which Boötes is driving his hunting-dogs in their leash of sidereal fire; carry on that arc until stars fade out, and galaxies, and all the infinities and eternities of time past and time to come are embraced within it, and then what have you? One little point of light—the whole of it is no more—to hold up before the noon of Christ's chastisement substituted for man's punishment. . . . . Speaking philosophically, addressing you in the mood of cool precision, I affirm, that if the great things man wants are riddance from the love of sin, and deliverance from the guilt of it, we can obtain the first best, and the latter only, by looking on the Cross. Those old words have unfathomable depth; and he who is to be born anew must sit beside that pupil in Bronsson Allcott's school, must imagine the benches to be the galaxies, and his human companions the angels and archangels who bow down on the golden floor, and on the shore of the sea of glass, and in presence of the Great White Throne, and cry out, 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty; Thou art worthy, for Thou didst so love the world that Thou gavest Thine only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.'" (P. 133-5.)

Mr. Cook, in an explanatory note appended to his last edition, says:—"The illustration from Mr. Allcott's school is a little arc, which represents a whole curve, but not a whole sphere. I claim only that it shows *in part* what Atonement is."

Digitized by Google

It is difficult to reconcile this statement with the description given of this little arc in the above extract. This "little arc" is there spoken of as becoming "the segment of a circle large enough to "reach from here to the galaxies; and then let all "the constellations shine on the circle as you carry "its line far past the spot over which Boötes is driv- "ing his hunting dogs in their leash of sidereal fire; "carry on that arc until stars fade out, and galaxies, "and all the infinities of time past and time to come "are embraced within it: and then what have you? "One little point of light—the whole of it is no "more—to hold up before the noon of Christ's "chastisement substituted for man's punishment." An arc thus enlarged, so that all the infinities and eternities of time past and time to come are embraced within it, cannot certainly be regarded as "little."

Mr. Cook speaks of the Atonement he describes as being needed "*to pay our debt to the school of "the universe.*" This implies that "the school of "the universe" (an expression wondrously comprehensive) is, by "the substitution of Christ's "chastisement for man's punishment," brought into the same relation to God as Allcott's school by Allcott's chastisement was brought into in relation to Allcott. That condition is an everlasting deliverance from all penal infliction; and a *possible* deliverance from perdition. This last, however, is uncertain. It depends on the degree in which the

Digitized by Google

apprehension of the substitution of Christ's voluntary chastisement for man's punishment becomes "the force which throws the shuttles that weave a new character [or *nature*, as said in one place] in the soul." Is this the result of Atonement? Is this that which believers find in the Cross? We must say so, if we follow Mr. Cook's line of thought. We must say that the one great oblation, once offered on the Cross, brings to the universe sure deliverance from all punishment, but that it brings to none *sure* deliverance from perdition—*that* being dependent on the effect wrought by the moral influences which the knowledge of the Atonement is intended to supply.

I am told that "he who is to be born anew must "sit beside that pupil in Bronsson Allcott's school, and "must imagine the benches to be the galaxies, and "his human companions the angels and the arch-"angels, who bow down on the golden floor, and "on the shore of the sea of glass, and in presence "of the Great White Throne, and cry out, Holy, "holy, holy, etc."

I can imagine no such thing. On the contrary, the Scripture teaches me that nothing can be more certain than that such moral influences as the illustration supposes, will utterly fail in penetrating the heart of man, and that they who rest their hopes on the effectiveness of such moral influences, must perish. How vast the difference between this conclusion and that arrived at by Mr. Cook! The Scripture says, "By grace ye HAVE BEEN SAVED

Digitized by Google

(ἐστε σεσωσμενοι) through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast: for we are His workmanship, CREATED IN CHRIST JESUS unto good works which God hath afore prepared (προητοιμασεν) that we should walk in them." *Certain* results these, all flowing, in the fixity of the purpose of God, from the Atonement accomplished on the Cross. But Mr. Cook, when he bids me look at the Cross, tells me to expect no such certain results from it. In his system the results are dependent on the will of the creature. The work of Immanuel finished on the Cross may, according to his system, bring Salvability, but it does not bring SALVATION. Mr. Cook could not say to believers, the moment they believe, σεσωσμενοι εστε, *ye have been saved.* Yet this is that which the Scripture doth say. And the words of Scripture are the words of God.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER X.

DIVINE IMMANENCE.

NOTHING can be more certain than that God in a manner incomprehensible to us, is present everywhere, and acteth everywhere. He knoweth all things, seeth all things, controlleth all things.

"Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I ascend up into heaven, Thou art there:
If I make my bed in hell, behold Thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea;
Even there shall Thy hand lead me,
And Thy right hand shall hold me."

But because we recognise that God as respects the exercise of His powers of knowledge and action is (in a manner inconceivable to us) everywhere present, yet we do not on that account ignore the fact that He has a distinctive dwelling place, and that that dwelling place is Heaven; and that He is there personally present in a manner in which He is not personally present in the earth.

"Unto Thee lift I up mine eyes,

Digitized by Google

"O Thou that dwellest in the heavens." (Ps. cxxiii. 3.)

"Hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place." (I Kings viii.)

The Lord Jesus taught us to pray, saying, "Our Father *which art in heaven:*" and Himself when He prayed, "lifted up His eyes to heaven." He said also to His disciples, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world and go to the Father." And again, "Jesus knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father," &c. And again, "I am no more in the world; but these are in the world, and I come to Thee." These and many like texts show that Heaven is a locality; that it is the dwelling place of God, and that He is personally present there in a sense in which He is not personally present in the earth.* When, therefore, we are told that "wherever God acts, there He is," we must ask

* The distinction between the personal presence of God, and of Christ, in Heaven, and the presence of their power in earth is carefully marked in the Revelation. The Lord Jesus was seen by John in Heaven under the symbol of a Lamb that had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which eyes are said to denote "the seven Spirits of God *sent out* into all the earth." (Rev. v.) In Rev. iv. the same Divine power of superintendence and control is represented by "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne." This power is said to be "*sent forth*" from the personal presence of God. Compare 2 Chronicles xvi. 9, "The eyes

Digitized by Google

for an explanation of the intended meaning before we accept the statement.

Mr. Cook speaks much of the Immanence of God.

"Your Helmholz and Wundt, and Beale and Carpenter, and Herschel and Faraday, and Darwin and Agassiz, as well as your Lotze and Kant and Leibnitz, and your St. Chrysostom, and Jeremy Taylor and Bishop Butler, all unite with Plato and Aristotle, and David and Isaiah, in asserting the Divine Personal Immanence in matter and mind. There is no cloud at this moment shot through by the noon so completely saturated by light as all mind and matter are by the Divine Immanence; that is to say, by this invisible, incomprehensible Personality which the moral law reveals." (P. 145.)

The language here used is strong and definite; sufficiently so, I should suppose, to satisfy the most advanced Pantheism. As a cloud at noontime is saturated with light, so all mind and matter are saturated by the "Divine Immanence," viz., that "invisible, incomprehensible Personality which the moral law reveals." After such a statement as this we cannot wonder that Darwin and Kant should be classed with David and Isaiah. They

---

of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong in behalf of them who are perfect before Him."

The tendency of *extreme* Pantheism to set aside the personal existence of God, and to speak of an all-pervading spirit, or soul of the Universe, renders it needful that we should be jealously watchful on this subject.

Digitized by Google

must all have minds "*saturated*" by the same Divine Immanence.

Divine Immanence is a holy expression. "Immanence" is a word derived from *ἐμμενω* or *μενω ἐν, to dwell or abide in.* It is employed in Scripture (and in no other sense do I consent to use it) to denote *first,* the in-dwelling presence of the Father in the Lord Jesus. "The Father that dwelleth in Me [*ὁ ἐν εμοι μενων*] He doeth the works." "In Him [Christ] dwelleth (*κατοικει*) all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." There is, *secondly,* in all true believers, an immanence or indwelling presence of God, which, though diverse from that just spoken of, is, nevertheless, a true and abiding immanence. The indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost as the Paraclete is the great present promise to the Church. The body of every believer is spoken of as being the temple of the Holy Ghost. (I Cor. vi. 19.) "By this we know that He [God] abideth in us (*μενει ἐν ἡμιν*), by the Spirit that He hath given us." (I John iii.) It is the special characteristic of the true Church to be thus indwelt in by the Holy Ghost. In them God IS: but He is not immanent either in matter or in mind. He is not immanent in the unconverted, or in devils. This immanence pertains only to the family of faith. It is a result of their being redeemed and placed under the headship of Him who is the Second Man — the Last Adam. Nothing in which God is immanent can perish. If God were im-

Digitized by Google

manent in matter, the earth would never be burned up: and if He were immanent in mind, mind would never be found in Hell.

Mr. Cook, however, insists that there is a "Divine Personal Immanence" of God in matter and in mind, and gives a list of propositions of which the first four are as follow.

"I. Since a Personal God is immanent in all matter and mind, it follows, that in all nature outside the soul, we look into God's face."

"II. For the same reason, it is incontrovertible, that in the soul we call Christ [I do not profess to understand what this means: I cannot suppose that it is intended to intimate that Christ is the all prevading soul of the universe] and in His influence in history, we look into God's face."

"III. For the same reason, it is certain, that, in the intuitions of conscience, we look into God's face." *

---

* Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the manner in which Mr. Cook treats the question of "intuition." Whatever intuitive powers of apprehension man may originally have had, they were all marred and perverted by the Fall, so that not one of his powers, mental or bodily, remained what they were before Sin "dwelt" in him. Moreover, God never left, and never intended to leave, man to be guided by intuition. Adam, as soon as created, became the subject of direct instruction from God. Noah and his sons descended from the ark, abundantly instructed by direct revelation from God. It was not intuition that led them to offer sacrifice, or to hope for the promised Deliverer, or to expect that awful end of human things which Enoch's prophecy had declared. Men's earliest axioms were founded on revela-

Digitized by Google

"IV. These three spheres of His self-manifestation embrace all of God that can be known to man."

I do not wish to criticise mere expressions with undue severity: yet when we remember that God has said, "No man can see My face and live"; and again, "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him"; it seems strange to be told that we may "look into the face of God:" (1) "*in all nature outside the soul:*" (2) "*in the soul we call Christ,*" (whatever that may mean), "*and in His influence in history:*" and (3) "*in the intuitions of conscience.*" The Scripture teaches far otherwise.

What (I would ask) would the effect of such teaching as this be on men generally? If instead of directing men to the Scripture alone, we should present as an alternative (though perhaps less perfect) way of becoming acquainted with God, this seeking Him in nature and in history—is there an unconverted man in the earth that would not abandon the Scripture and place himself in the

---

tion. Man from the beginning has been placed under instruction from God. When God had once spoken in the world, a source of knowledge was opened very different from that which intuition could supply. The effects of the traditional communication of knowledge originally imparted by God cannot be traced by us: but these effects exist, and nullify everything that philosophy is wont to say about intuition and the like.

Digitized by Google

School of Nature? Nothing would more accord with the temper of the present hour than to tell men that the teaching of the Apostles and Prophets in Holy Scripture is not indispensable to the attainment of the knowledge of God; that every man has God within his own bosom, and that by seeking Him *there*, he will find and "look into God's face." When Irving, in conversation with Carlyle, appealed to a chapter in the Corinthians as the ground on which he based his conclusions, how did Carlyle reply? "I stated plainly to him," says Carlyle, "that he must permit me a few words for relief of my conscience before leaving him (for we knew not what length of time) on a course which I could not but regard as full of danger to him. That the 13th *of the Corinthians* to which he always appealed, was surely too narrow a basis for so high a tower as he was building upon it, a high lean tower, or quasi-*mast*, piece added to piece, till it soared far above all human science and experience, and flatly contradicted all that, founded solely on a little text of *writing* in an ancient book! No sound judgment on such warranty could venture on such an enterprise. Authentic 'writings' of the Most High, were they found in old books only? They were in the stars and on the rocks, and in the brain and heart of every mortal; not dubious these to any person, as this 13th of Corinthians very greatly was. That it did not beseem him, Edward Irving, to be hang-

Digitized by Google

ing on the rearward of mankind, struggling still to chain them to old notions not now well tenable, but to be foremost in the van, leading on by the light of the eternal stars across this hideous delirious wilderness where we all were, towards promised lands that lay ahead. Bethink you, my friend, I said, is not your plainly commanded duty more plain than any 13th of Corinthians can be. I bid you pause and consider; *that* verily is my solemn advice to you." ("Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle," edited by James A. Froude, p. 321.)

I am far from saying that Mr. Cook would endorse these sentiments; yet their germ lies hid in the propositions we are considering, and that germ would soon develop itself throughout society if these propositions were adopted. We should soon be taught to look for "authentic writings of the Most High," not in "old books" at all, but "in the stars and on the rocks, and in the brain and heart of every mortal."

No doubt if conscience be God, as Mr. Cook affirms, every man has God within him, and may turn to the intuitions of conscience as Divine. But how then could men be what God declares that they are — *αθεοι*, "without God"? The Apostle Paul, whilst unconverted, had a conscience, and acted, we are told, according to its intuitions, for he "thought he was doing God service" when he was persecuting Christ, and Christ's people. Did he whilst looking to the intuitions of conscience

Digitized by Google

look into God's face? Did his intuitions lead him to God? If we say, no, then what becomes of Mr. Cook's propositions? After his conversion, indeed, we find the Apostle speaking of his conscience as "bearing witness in the Holy Ghost." In that case there was, no doubt, certainty and right guidance: but the certainty was not founded on any natural intuitions: and the very contrast drawn in these words between "conscience" and the Holy Ghost, proves that the Conscience was not God, nor invested with the authority of God.

It will not be denied that there is nothing more needed by man than true "self-knowledge." "Know thyself," was one of the vaunted maxims of antiquity. Man can advance in nothing if he be ignorant of himself as respects his relation to God. Can conscience, or intuition, or anything else except revelation, bring the human heart to a recognition of its innate condition of sin? Did Paul by the intuitions of conscience find out the evil desire (*ἐπιθυμια*) that was in him? Does he not tell us that he owed "the *knowledge* of sin" to the law as promulgated by God at Sinai? "I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not desire" — *οὐκ ἐπιθυμησεις*. That commandment wrought in him all manner of evil desire, and so he *recognised* his condition of moral death before God. If the conscience, and intuition, and everything else to which man has naturally access, cannot teach him even this primary lesson,

Digitized by Google

how can conscience be divine, or how can it lead him to God? Mr. Cook with all the light he has gained from conscience, intuition, and the like, has not received these words of the Law, for he looks upon sin as following not upon evil "desire," but upon evil "choice." Can there be a plainer proof that the teachings of conscience and intuition are unable to bring to the knowledge of God?

Conscience is indeed the organ through which the appeals of God are made to the soul, but in many it is seared as with a hot iron; in all it is diseased, and in its best state it can only receive appeals. It gives no power to answer these appeals. Felix may be so far convicted as to tremble: the stoners of Stephen may be convicted and may gnash with their teeth: but until God by a supreme act of grace quickens the soul and brings it to the knowledge of Jesus, there is no real apprehension of the true nature of sin, or of holiness, or of redemption through Jesus. Conscience can never teach the meaning either of being "constituted sinners by one man's disobedience," or of being "constituted by one man's obedience righteous," much less supply the means of attaining to that righteousness. Even Solomon with all the superhuman ability granted him to search into all the natural relations of man, could find nothing in result save vanity and vexation of spirit. Things were wanting that could not be supplied: things were crooked and could not be made straight. Yet even Solomon attempted not to read the book of Nature,

apart from light which Revelation supplied. But Mr. Cook follows neither Paul nor Solomon. He follows rather that early ruiner of Christian Truth, Clemens Alexandrinus, who said, "As the husbandman first waters the soil, and then casts in his seed, so the notions *which I derive out of the writings of the Gentiles* serve first to water and soften the earthy parts of the soul, that the spiritual seed may be the better cast in, and take vital root in the minds of men." So likewise we find Mr. Cook saying—

"It has been my speciality for the last ten years to study logical, physiological, metaphysical, theological, and ethical architecture. It is trite, beyond measure, to say, although some sceptics seem never to have heard, that it is the duty of every theological student to know with uncommon thoroughness logic and metaphysics, and the chief results of the most advanced physiological as well of the latest exegetical research. I should consider myself unfit to hold up my rushlight before religious truth everywhere, if I had not given myself to these topics for years, not only under the best guidance, but with the freest spirit." ("Lectures," 2nd Series, page 71.)

Such is the School in which Mr. Cook has been trained, and in which he desires that others should be trained in order that they might be made "able ministers" of the Truth. The Apostle Paul was otherwise minded. He said that "the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God." Accordingly, when he came to the philosophic and refined Corinthians, he came "not with excellency of speech" or of wisdom, but "determined to know nothing

Digitized by Google

among them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified," —his one mighty instrument being "the foolishness of preaching." He further says, "the natural mind receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: *neither can he know them*" (1 Cor. ii.): and yet natural men have conscience and intuitions, and are able to reason, syllogise, and the like. What likeness, therefore, is there between the conclusions to which Mr. Cook has been led by "culture," and the conclusions to which the Scripture leads? Is there one of the extracts made from Mr. Cook's writings in the preceding pages that is capable of being reconciled with the Word of God? No doubt Mr. Cook is sincere in his desire to act upon the advanced infidelity of the day, and to recover some souls from it, but of what avail is recovery, if it be not recovery to pure Bible Truth? None who stand without the circle of revealed Truth are recovered to God; and the extracts uphold doctrines which place us outside that circle. Revealed Truth is manipulated, modified, and altered in order that science and the minds of natural men, who neither know nor can know the things of God, might be conciliated. The extracts already given sufficiently prove this, but I will add (not at any great length) some further evidence.

Let us take the great question of *Creation*. Mr. Cook does not believe that everything was created from nothing. Indeed he does not believe that the seen Universe was created at all, but *evolved* from God. He believes that as unseen electricity and

invisible moisture are in the air, so the universe of matter was in God, and thence evolved.

If matter had been in God, matter must be eternal, unless we say that God was *not* eternal. Nor could we any longer say that God is a Spirit, for matter is not spirit. The Scripture says, God *created;* Mr. Cook says, God *evolved.* Evolution is not creation. The words בָּרָא, עָשָׂה, κτιζω and ποιεω, which are the words by which God denotes His creative action, express ideas right contrary to *evolution.* These words would have no application to that which was found existent in, and evolved from, an eternal Being. If as electricity and moisture are in the air, so the seen universe of matter lay hid in God, the seen universe could not have been created in the manner in which God in Genesis declares it was, or indeed in any other manner. It must have existed in God, and formed in eternity a constituent part of His being.

Before the heavens and earth came into existence (εγενοντο) God WAS (*HN*). As soon as the angels were created they recognised His existence and His glory. They beheld Him create the material universe, and they rejoiced. "The sons of God shouted for joy." The Most High therefore had a phenomenal, *i.e.* apparent existence, and was regarded by the principalities and powers in heavenly places as having such an existence. He was emphatically Ὁ φαινομενος, the Apparent One. Now if, as Mr. Cook imagines, the seen universe (το βλεπομενον) was evolved from Him, it must have come into

existence out of (*εκ*) One who had a phenomenal existence (*εκ του φαινομενου*), whereas the Scripture declares that "that which is seen did not come into existence out of anything which was apparent"—*εις το μη εκ φαινομενων το βλεπομενον γεγονεναι.* Here then is direct contrariety of statement between Mr. Cook and the Scripture. Which shall we follow?

Further, Mr. Cook thinks that we now have within our physical body, a spiritual body, which spiritual body is not separated from the soul at death. "It becomes clear," says Mr. Cook, "that "even in that state of existence which succeeds "death, the soul may have a spiritual body."

Is this so? Do the words of Mr. Cook harmonise with the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. xv.?

The Scripture teaches us that we are not to be clothed upon with our spiritual body until the resurrection at the last trump. Mr. Cook thinks that we have an unseen spiritual body now, and that the soul when it quits the natural body may retain its spiritual body. If this were so, not only should we have a spiritual body without resurrection, and before the last trump, but the possession of a spiritual body would be the result of connexion with the earthy Adam, for we should be born with it.

Furthermore, the Scripture pointedly contrasts our first condition, whilst possessed of a natural body, with another subsequent condition that we are to have when possessed of the natural body changed, and made a glorious spiritual body.

Digitized by Google

The Scripture also distinctly speaks of our disembodied state as being one in which we are "unclothed." It declares that the *same* body that is sown in corruption is at the last trump to be "raised" in incorruption.

All this Mr. Cook's theory subverts. It speaks of our having a non-atomic ethereal body hidden in our present physical body—of that ethereal body continuing to enswathe the soul when it quits the physical body, and supposes that our present bodies will not be either "raised," or "quickened," or "metamorphosed," or "changed"* into glorified spiritual bodies, but that another body, which we now secretly possess, and which never dies, and which therefore can never be quickened, nor ever raised, is the spiritual body of which the Scripture speaks.

Again we find Mr. Cook saying:

"It has pleased Him whose hand moulds the centuries to make the progress of science very nearly the most characteristic feature of the present age. Science, as defended by its less thoroughly cultivated votaries, has many faults. It sometimes makes arrogant claims. But it has one righteous thing in it; that is, the love of clear ideas. The holy and intense creed of reverence for proof, clear ideas at any cost, and obedience the organ of spiritual knowledge, will live. It will go through the centuries of coming time without wreck. I believe that the love of clear ideas, and impatience of their opposite, which characterise the educated mind of the

* Such are the words by which Scripture denotes the change that is to take place in our present bodies.

Digitized by Google

present age, are as truly a Pentecost from the Divine Hand, as if they were evidenced by tongues of flame. The gauntlet is at last thrown down.

> 'Doubts to the world's child heart unknown,
> Question us now from star and stone;
> The power is lost to self-deceive
> With hollow forms of make-believe.'

Faith and Reason challenge each other to the death. I see herein promise, not of destruction for either, but of reinforced and mutually harmonious life for both. Science, against its choice, will show that every natural fact is in the strictest sense a religious fact. Startling us in some past years, it has been blindly bringing us to that great result. The eve of an unexpected time I believe to be at hand; to educated minds, faith will make science religious, and science make faith scientific. The Word and works of God must flow together after the year 1900! I think I hear that angel of good already sing in the wind."—(Second Series, p. 136.)

The love of clear ideas is evidently one of Mr. Cook's chief idols. May I be permitted to ask whether we can have really clear ideas on any subject which we do not thoroughly understand? "We ought to understand thoroughly," will probably be Mr. Cook's reply. But is this so? The Scripture saith otherwise. "If any man thinketh he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." And again, "We know in part." "We see through a glass darkly" (*ἐν αἰνιγματι*). If we follow Mr. Cook's "culture," we must alter these words: for "*darkly*" we must substitute "*clearly*." Elsewhere he adopts the German adage, and says "Whatever is clear is true." No maxim can be more dangerous. We know only in part, we see

Digitized by Google

darkly. If a supposed clearness is attained, it is attained by altering the truths of Revelation, or else the aspects in which those truths are revealed, so that what we see clearly is the fabrication of our own misguided minds, not verity presented to our faith on the authority of God. He who believes only what he understands, refuses to enter the School of God. There we have axioms based on the authority of God. We have "established principles to be granted without fresh proof." We believe, not because we understand that which has been revealed, but because we confide in the wisdom of Him who has revealed it. It must, indeed, be made perfectly clear to us that that which we are asked to believe is revealed in Scripture. As to that, we must exercise our understanding to the utmost. But when satisfied on this point, it would be madness to suppose that we can fully comprehend the mysteries revealed. Even the spiritual powers of the regenerate are declared to be inadequate; how much more the natural powers of those of whom it is said that they "receive not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can they know them." The people of God have their axioms prepared for them by God in His holy Word. On them they found their reasonings; thence they draw their conclusions; and their conclusions are sure. Sacerdotalism has for ages ruined Christendom by claiming the right of preparing axioms based on the authority of the living voice of the Spirit in the Church. The yoke thus imposed has been a

Digitized by Google

yoke of iron. The scientific school now proposes to present to us axioms founded on the ratiocinations and intuitions of cultured fallen man; but neither the Sacerdotal nor the Scientific axioms will for one moment bear the testing touch of Scripture, which is to them like Ithuriel's spear. The phantom vanishes; the yoke is broken; and we are set free, to know and to rejoice in that freedom wherewith the Truth, and the Truth alone, maketh free. Tell a man to listen to the living voice of the Spirit in the Church, or to the voice of conscience within him, whether guided by "culture" or not—tell him to trust in a verifying faculty within, or to the rocks and stones and stars to which Carlyle bade Irving look—guide him indeed to any thing except the Word of the living God, and you leave him still buried in that darkness in the midst of which the true Light shone, but the darkness comprehended it not.

In order that I may not be supposed to misrepresent Mr. Cook I will quote his exact words as found in the 2nd Series of his Lectures, published by R. R. Dickinson, London, "by" (as is stated on the title page) "permission of the author."

On page 77 of these Lectures Mr. Cook gives a long list of "propositions," which list he prefaces thus :—

"I am accustomed to recite as a part of my private creed these propositions, based on De Wette's concession as to the fact of the resurrection."

Prop. 9. "The late German philosophy holds the view that the soul must be conceived of as a property or occupant of a fluid similar to ether."

Digitized by Google

Prop. 10. "This fluid, however, does not, like the ether, consists of atoms. . . . . It is Ulrici's view that the soul is the occupant of a non-atomic ether that fills the whole form, and lies behind the mysterious weaving of the tissues."

Prop. 21. ". . . . The acutest philosophy is now pondering what the possibilities of this non-atomic ethereal body are when separated from the fleshy body; and the opinion of Germany is coming to be very emphatic that all that materialists have said about our memory ending when our physical bodies are dissolved, and about there being no possibility of the activity of the soul in separation from the physical body is simply lack of education. There is high authority and great unanimity on the propositions I am now defending; and, although I do not pledge myself always to defend every one of these theses, yet I must do so in the present state of knowledge, and in the name of a gulf-current of speculation which is twenty-five years long, and which has a very victorious aspect as we look backward to the time when the microscope began its revelations."

Prop. 22. "It becomes, clear, therefore, that even in that state of existence which succeeds death, the soul may have a spiritual body."

"What! You are preaching to us the book called the Holy Word? Yes, I am; and the living tissues form a page of it. A spiritual body! That is a phrase we did not expect to hear in the name of science. It is the latest whisper of science, though ages ago it was a word of revelation."

Prop. 23. "The existence of that body preserves the memories acquired during life in the flesh."

Prop. 24. "If this ethereal non-atomic enswathement of the soul be interpreted to mean what the Scriptures mean by a spiritual body in distinction from a natural body, there is entire harmony between the latest results of science and the inspired doctrine of the resurrection." (2nd Series, pp. 81, 84.)

Digitized by Google

Notice.

TIME not allowing me to proceed further at present, I hope soon to print a short second number with Appendix. Mr. Cook having expressed a wish that I should not publish his letter to which I have referred in the Preface, I shall of course comply with his request.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Remarks

ON A BOOK

ENTITLED "NATURAL LAW IN THE SPIRITUAL WORLD,"

BY HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.I., F.G.S.

BEING THE

Substance of Four Lectures given in London

BY

BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.

LONDON

C. M. TUCKER, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER,

12, CHARTERHOUSE SQUARE, E.C.1.

PHONE—CITY 4488.

1884.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Remarks,

ETC.

EXPOSITION of Scripture is, as you are aware, the object of my Lectures in this place. On the present occasion, however, I deviate from my general habit, and shall ask your attention to some remarks on a book recently published, under the title of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," a strange and ominous title, for it seems avowedly to negative the contrast which, even intuitively, we are wont to draw, and which Scripture certainly bids us draw, between that which is Natural and that which is Spiritual. The suspicion aroused by the title will be confirmed by an examination of the volume.

Yet it is a book widely circulated and widely welcomed, even by Evangelical Christians: and although few here present have been themselves shaken, yet many have been distressed by its influence over their friends, and have asked me for explanation. The subject is, no doubt, one of vast importance. Nothing is more to be resisted than an attempt to bridge over the gulf which

Digitized by Google

separates, and will separate for ever and ever, Evangelical, from Philosophical Christianity.

In speaking to you, I speak to those who receive the Scripture as *inspired and authoritative.* To have a fixed and *authoritative* rule is our distinctive and blessed privilege as believers. Doubt, to a sensitive conscience, must be misery. No one can act aright, or be happy, who has no formed and fixed conclusions to guide his moral and religious course. Such conclusions, however, we cannot have, unless we have sure and certain *axioms* on which to base our reasoning. Such axioms God has in His mercy given in the Scripture: *but only there.* Set aside the *authority* of Scripture, and say that you will receive nothing that your understanding cannot grasp, and you are like a mariner without a compass and without a chart, driven before the tempest. Everything that God hath said is, to a right-minded believer, an axiom, requiring no further proof than the fact that He hath said it.

My object in these Lectures will not be to give you an analysis of Mr. Drummond's book, or to argue philosophically against it. I shall simply quote certain passages: show you what the statements of those passages are: ask you to test them by the Word of God, and so form your own judgment. God has given to all His true people ability to do this. "The spiritual man," says the Apostle, "estimateth (*ανακρινει*) all things." God speaks

Digitized by Google

also of having given us "His own divine power in all things that pertain to life and godliness." We are responsible, therefore, for exercising this power. When a book is tested by the Word of God, and fails to answer to that test, we are bound to reject, eschew, and oppose it. Otherwise, we turn from light and accept darkness: and "he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth."

The proper province of physical philosophy is to ascertain facts, and to register them when *proved*: but if it go farther and seek to account for such facts, it exceeds its powers. It steps beyond its boundary. The microscope has, no doubt, brought to light many of the hidden operations of God's hand. It has disclosed to the eye the workings of an energetic power, whereby the various forms of vegetable and animal being are fashioned, ordered, and sustained. I have never yet heard of one actually *proved* fact respecting the working of these powers that is not reconcilable with, or indeed necessarily assignable to, the existence of One Great First Cause—even Him whom the Bible declares to be "The Quickener of all things." (1 Tim. vi. 13.) It is not *Life* that quickens: it is a *Person* who quickens. He gives the Life; and after He has given it, He directs and sustains its operations. The result of the operations men see: but the nature of the operating power, and the mode of its connexion with Him who creates and orders it, they understand not. Yet they desire

Digitized by Google

to see, and to know, and to explain; and in their vain attempt to do this, they fall into the snare of the Evil One, and are led on, step by step, till they abandon the Bible, and reject God. Men are at this moment labouring to discover the cause of Life, as if God was not the Cause! Is not He the Creator, the Quickener, and the Sustainer of all things? "In Him we live and move and have our being." "He upholdeth all things by the word of His power." "By Him all things consist." In respect of the operation of the power of God we may fitly say thereof, that it—

> "Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
> Glows in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,
> Lives through all life, extends to all extent,
> Spreads undivided, operates unspent."

This is true as respects God's power. But if the warmth, and the light, and the life be said to be Himself, and to be an impersonation of Deity; or if the operative and diffused life whose workings we discern, be regarded as something that has an independent existence, springing in some mysterious way from "Matter," and regulated by laws inherent in Matter, or emanating from any source save One—namely, the Eternal and Self-existent Being who has revealed Himself to us as Jehovah, the God of Israel—if any such things be taught, we have to regard such doctrine, however modified, as deadly and soul-destroying heresy, whose birthplace is "the Pit."

Digitized by Google

Now, Evolutionism, whatever its specific form, however much it may seek to modify its statements by qualifications, or to hallow them by quotations from Scripture, is compelled by the necessity of its position, to set itself, many times and in many things, against Scripture and against God. Mr. Drummond, when he became an Evolutionist, was obliged to accept the dogma of the school, and to say, "Ex nihilo nihil"—nothing can be made out of nothing. "MATTER IS UNCREATABLE AND INDESTRUCTIBLE." This formula Mr. Drummond adopts. (*See* page 297.) If this be so, God is not the Creator of all things. Matter, if "uncreatable," must be eternal. Consequently, God can neither be the Creator of all things, nor the One only self-existent One. Nor can He be omnipotent, for matter (it is said) is "indestructible." Thus God is robbed of His characteristic attributes, and His Word (and therefore Himself) charged with falsehood. The words, "Matter is uncreatable," are in themselves sufficient to mark any book that adopts them, as a book avowedly antagonistic to the Bible and to God.

Digitized by Google

§ II.

IN Mr. Drummond's preface, page ix., we read as follows:—

"Can it be said that the Phenomena of the Spiritual World are other than scattered? Can we shut our eyes to the fact that the religious opinions of mankind are in a state of flux? And when we regard the uncertainty of current beliefs, the war of creeds, the havoc of inevitable as well as of idle doubt, the reluctant abandonment of early faith by those who would cherish it longer if they could, is it not plain that the one thing thinking men are waiting for is the introduction of Law among the Phenomena of the Spiritual World? When that comes we shall offer to such men a truly scientific theology. And the Reign of Law will transform the whole Spiritual World as it has already transformed the Natural World."

The concluding words of this paragraph sound strangely. They state that "the Natural World has been transformed." How? And when? The surface of the globe was changed vastly at the time of the Flood; but we cannot say that that change amounted to a transformation of the Natural World. The world, as to all its essential characteristics, has remained what it ever hath been since Adam fell. "There is no new thing under the sun." Nor can progress of knowledge be said to "transform" the subject of such knowledge. The statement, therefore, in this passage is inaccurate and misleading.

Digitized by Google

If the Author means that men's thoughts respecting the Natural World have been by modern Science transformed, the statement may pass unchallenged. No doubt there has been as to this a vast change. But then the question arises, Has the change been for good, or for evil? Our knowledge of facts may have increased; but what if that knowledge has been used to transform our knowledge of God and of the Bible in such a way as to banish light, and bring in darkness?

Awfully true it is that there has been such a transformation. Men used to believe that God was the Creator of all things, and also the Quickener of all things, and the Upholder of all things; and that He was the God of Truth, and that what He spake on Sinai and wrote in Genesis was strictly true. But now we are to unlearn all this. *Tout cela est changé.* We are to admit that "Matter is uncreatable" and the like: and we are to pronounce the Bible to be scientifically false. And further, Evolutionary Science after having thus revolutionised men's thoughts as to the Natural World, is now carrying its inroads into the Spiritual World; and Mr. Drummond asks us to believe that the organisation of the Natural World is about to rectify the disorganisation of the Spiritual. "The reign of Law," he says, "will transform the whole Spiritual World." In that case the true knowledge of

Digitized by Google

God and of the Bible will certainly be driven out of both.

Mr. Drummond speaks of "the religious opinions of men" being "in a state of flux." I do not deny this; but let me ask whether science by its mendacities has not been one of the chief agencies in producing this result? I am bold to say that until the present voice of Science has been silenced by the voice of Revelation (as in the next Dispensation it will be), this condition of "flux" will never cease, but will go on working till it brings in that chaos of Antichristian blasphemy, of which the Scripture has from the beginning warned us.

And here I would further ask whether the philosophic opinions of mankind are not in a state of flux quite as much as their religious? Evidences of the disagreement of Scientists, even as respects the facts of their various systems, are multiplied on every side. Mr. Drummond seems to blind himself to this, and to dwell in a Utopia where phantoms and unrealities surround him. Otherwise he would soon perceive that the philosophic opinions of mankind are, and ever have been, in a hopeless "state of flux": and surely disorganisation can organise nothing. In a subsequent section I hope to remark further on this.

It is quite true that there are Natural Laws appointed of God, and Spiritual Laws appointed

Digitized by Google

of God, having their distinct spheres of operation. But men, departing from God and from the guidance of His Word, have formed their own opinions about Natural Law and about Spiritual Law, and thus have sprung up diverse Schools of Philosophy, and diverse Schools of so-called Theology. But the Theology of man is one thing, and the Theology of God another. The result of the operations of these various Schools—Scientific and Religious, has been uncertainty and confusion, increasing every day. "The foundations of all things are out of course," and of this God has forewarned us. Nothing can be more vivid, or more awful than the picture He has drawn in the Scripture of the now approaching end. See, for example, the concluding part of the eighth chapter of Isaiah. Speaking of the chaotic ruin, when men will turn to anything, even "to wizards that peep and mutter," rather than to God, He says, "They shall pass through it hardly bestead and hungry: and it shall come to pass, that, when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves, and curse their King and their God, and shall look upward. And they shall look unto the earth; and behold trouble and darkness, dimness of anguish!" Yet in the midst of the dread scene we read of some whom God calls "disciples," and who are not abandoned. "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. . . . To the law and to the testimony: if they speak

Digitized by Google

not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Thus there is one light, and one only that is fixed, stable, and unchangeable, even the light of God's Word written. So saith the Holy One that inhabiteth eternity. But Mr. Drummond thinks otherwise. Mark well the decision of his words. Mr. Drummond says: "*The one thing in the world that is sure*"—"*the one thing that holds on its way to me eternally, incorrupt and undefiled,*" is—What? The Bible? No: not the Bible but "*Natural Law*"! Here indeed is contrariety of thought between Mr. Drummond and the Bible. Shall we follow the advice of Mr. Drummond, or the commandment of God? We *must* make our election. We cannot follow both.

Mr. Drummond's panacea is, "Natural Law." He says, "We have Truth in Nature as it came from God." (Preface, p. xi.) Has Mr. Drummond in saying this ever considered the difference between a paradisiacal creation, and a creation fallen, stricken, and groaning in the bondage of corruption! In contemplating fallen Man, tenanted in body, soul and spirit by Indwelling Sin, do we learn "Truth in Nature, as it came from God?" Again he says:—

"Theology must feel to-day that the modern world calls for a further proof. Nor will the best Theology resent this demand; it also demands it. Theology is searching on every hand for another echo of the Voice of which Revela-

Digitized by Google

tion also is the echo, that out of the mouths of two witnesses its truths should be established. That other echo can only come from Nature. Hitherto its voice has been muffled. But now that Science has made the world around articulate, it speaks to Religion with a twofold purpose. In the first place it offers to corroborate Theology, in the second to purify it. . . . Science, therefore, may yet have to be called upon to arbitrate at some points between conflicting creeds. And while there are some departments of Theology where its jurisdiction cannot be sought, there are others in which Nature may yet have to define the contents as well as the limits of belief." (Preface, pp. xxviii. and xxix.)

Observe the words, "define the contents" [*i. e.*, the subject-matter] "as well as the limits of belief." Rome tells me that the Church is to do this. Mr. Drummond says, Nature and Science are to do it. God tells me that the Bible hath already done it. Whom am I to believe? The Lord Jesus turned both from the Traditionalism of the Pharisee, and from the Scepticism of the Sadducee, and said: "THE SCRIPTURE CANNOT BE BROKEN," and what He said then He even more emphatically says now.

"What impresses a man," says Mr. Drummond, "about Nature is its solidity. He is there standing upon actual things, among fixed laws." Certainly these words intimate that there is a solidity found in the testimonies of Nature that is not found in those of Scripture; and yet God says that He has "magnified His Word above all His name."

Digitized by Google

"To those," says Mr. Drummond, "who are feeling their way to a Christian life, haunted now by a sense of instability in the foundations of their faith, now brought to bay by specific doubt at one point raising, as all doubt does, the question for the whole, I would hold up a light which has often been kind to me. There is a sense of solidity about a Law of Nature which belongs to nothing else in the world. Here, at last, amid all that is shifting, is one thing sure; one thing outside ourselves, unbiassed, unprejudiced, uninfluenced by like or dislike, by doubt or fear; one thing that holds on its way to me eternally, incorruptible and undefiled. This, more than anything else, makes one eager to see the Reign of Law traced in the Spiritual Sphere. And should this seem to some to offer only a surer, but not a higher Faith; should the better ordering of the Spiritual World appear to satisfy the intellect at the sacrifice of reverence, simplicity, or love; especially should it seem to substitute a Reign of Law and a Lawgiver for a Kingdom of Grace and a Personal God, I will say, with Browning,—

> I spoke as I saw.
> I report, as a man may, of God's work—*all's Love, yet all's Law.*
> Now I lay down the judgeship He lent me. Each faculty tasked,
> To perceive Him, has gained an abyss where a dew-drop was asked.'" (Preface, p. xxiii.)

There is an empty mystic ambiguity about these lines: but whatever else they may mean, they mean this, that he has found through the teaching of Nature that which he could not find from the teaching of the Word of God. He says, "There is a sense of solidity about a Law of Nature, *which belongs to nothing else in the world.*" And

Digitized by Google

again, there is *one thing* [the Law of Nature] that holds on its way to me eternally, *incorruptible and undefiled.*" Where do these statements place the Bible? Certainly not where God places it. We are asked to believe that "a sense of solidity attaches to a Law of Nature that belongs to NOTHING else in the world!" For this to be said of any mere Law of Nature would be fearful enough, but when we remember that the expression "Law of Nature," as here used, must be understood to include such laws as men *imagine* themselves to have discovered, and especially such laws as the speculations of Evolutionism propound, shall we say that a sense of solidity, greater than that which attaches to Scripture or anything else in the world, attaches to such laws? Of all persons in the world, Evolutionists, surely, have least reason to glory in the stability and certainty of their laws. A little while ago it was imagined that the origination of life (a point vastly important in their system) was spontaneous. Now it is reluctantly acknowledged that the facts relied on were no facts at all.* Many anticipations have been indulged in as to the discovery of the missing link between Ape and Man, but no such link is forthcoming. All is *in nubibus.* Great anxiety has been shown to discover a skull that might be asserted to be pre-adamic. No such skull can be produced. Evolutionary *theories* (for

* See Appendix A.

Digitized by Google

it would be a misnomer to call them *Laws*) are all in a state of "flux" or retrocession. Are we to believe that to such theories attaches "a sense of solidity that attaches to NOTHING ELSE IN THE WORLD"? When men choose to blind themselves they can.

§ III.

It may be well, before we go farther, to read Mr. Drummond's own account of the manner in which he has reached these conclusions. He says:—

"It has been my privilege for some years to address regularly two very different audiences on two very different themes. On week-days I have lectured to a class of students on the Natural Sciences, and on Sundays to an audience consisting for the most part of working men, on subjects of a moral and religious character. I cannot say that this collocation ever appeared as a difficulty to myself, but to certain of my friends it was more than a problem. It was solved to me, however, at first, by what then seemed the necessities of the case—I must keep the two departments entirely by themselves. They lie at opposite poles of thought; and for a time I succeeded in keeping the Science and the Religion shut off from one another in two separate compartments of my mind. But gradually the wall of partition showed symptoms of giving way. The two fountains of knowledge also slowly began to overflow, and finally their waters met and mingled. The great change was in the compartment which held the Religion.

Digitized by Google

It was not that the well there was dried; still less that the fermenting waters were washed away by the flood of Science. The actual contents remained the same. But the crystals of former doctrine were dissolved; and as they precipitated themselves once more in definite forms, I observed that the Crystalline System was changed. New channels also for outward expression opened, and some of the old closed up; and I found the truth running out to my audience on the Sundays by the week-day outlets. In other words, the subject-matter Religion had taken on the method of expression of Science, and I discovered myself enunciating Spiritual Law in the exact terms of Biology and Physics.

"Now this was not simply a scientific colouring given to Religion, the mere freshening of the theological air with natural facts and illustrations. It was an entire re-casting of truth. And when I came seriously to consider what it involved, I saw, or seemed to see, that it meant essentially the introduction of Natural Law into the Spiritual World." (Preface, page vi.)

Now, mark the magnitude of the object proposed. It is nothing less than a "*re-casting* of Truth"; and it will be found in the result that this means a "re-casting" of the Bible; or, what practically comes to the same thing, an exclusion of certain Scripture verities from the "re-cast" truth. An example is afforded in the passage just quoted. Nothing can be more evident than that the words of the Apostle in 1 Cor. ii. place the natural and the spiritual sphere in contrast—a contrast so marked, so decided, that "the words of man's wisdom" were not to be used in im-

Digitized by Google

parting the revelations the Apostle was appointed to declare. "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; explaining (συγκρινοντες) spiritual things by spiritual." And again, "I, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimonies of God." Here we find, "the taught words of human wisdom" (for such literally is the Apostle's expression) forbidden. Yet Mr. Drummond, despising the warning, tells us triumphantly that he found that the subject of Religion had, in his case, "taken on the method of expression of Science," and that he discovered himself "enunciating Spiritual Law in the exact terms of Biology and Physics"—the very thing that the Apostle condemns. Certainly the instruction of 1 Cor. ii. must be discarded, if the new methods of Mr. Drummond be received. "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," are words which are, in themselves a virtual repudiation of that chapter.

Mr. Drummond says:—

"The right of the Spiritual World to speak of its own phenomena is as secure as the right of the Natural World to speak of itself. What is Science but what the Natural World has said to Natural men? What is Revelation but what the Spiritual World has said to Spiritual men?" (P. 73.)

This is a strange definition. Revelation is not what the Spiritual World, or any other world,

Digitized by Google

has said. Revelation is that which *God has said* respecting the Spiritual World, and the Natural World, and all things whereof God speaketh. It pertains to God only to reveal: our place is humbly to read all things in the light of His revelation. We shall find many things, not only *super*natural, but *contra*-natural: "things that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into man's heart to conceive." Natural Law and Science can little avail here. Men *say*, indeed, that they have heard the voice of the Natural World. Hence Science. Others say, "I have heard the voice of the Spiritual World." Hence Traditional Religion, Buddhism, and the like. Faith says, "I have heard the voice of God in the Bible." That is something far different: *there* truth and stability are: but there alone.

As to Science, that (to use Mr. Drummond's definition) which "the Natural World has taught to natural men," how can I trust Science? Do not its dogmas jar perpetually? Thus Mr. Herbert Spencer, to whom, according to Mr. Drummond,*

---

* Mr. Drummond seems to delight in quoting and praising Mr. Herbert Spencer. He says, "Mr. Herbert Spencer's masterly illustrations of the chief phenomena of life have placed philosophy and science under many obligations; and in the paragraphs that follow we shall have to incur a further debt *on behalf of religion*." Does Religion owe a debt to Mr. Herbert Spencer for removing the Creator out of the Universe?

Digitized by Google

religion, as well as science, is not a little indebted, tells us that "The man of Science is in the presence of *an infinite and eternal energy* from which all things proceed." "This eternal energy" (I quote the words of a recent critique on his writings) "is Mr. Herbert Spencer's substitute for God. Having removed the Creator out of the Universe, we are invited to regard the void thus caused as in itself possessing the attributes, and performing the acts, of Deity."

Another writer, who scornfully rejects Mr. Herbert Spencer's theory, substitutes for it something no less revolting. In the stead of a Personal God he forms for himself an Abstraction—a creation of his own brain—an imaginary Existence made up of the good in all men and women that ever were, or shall be; in other words, we are to worship Humanity—an abstract fictitious Humanity that has no existence.

A third writer, Sir James Stephens, says, "If human life is in the course of being fully described by Science, I do not see what materials there are for any religion, or indeed what would be the use of one, or why it is wanted. We can get on very well without one; for though the view of life which Science is opening to us gives us nothing to worship, it gives us an infinite number of things to enjoy."

I refer to these examples merely to show how the disciples of Science differ. Not two think

Digitized by Google

alike. Yet they all profess to have received their lessons in the School of Nature. Mr. Drummond, who consents to be a scholar in that school, has not been led as yet into the same extent of distance from God; yet he is moving rapidly in the same direction, and has clearly renounced the Bible as his guide. If he had not, he could not have spoken of Natural Law as being "*the one thing*" in the world that is sure—"*the one thing* that holds on its way to him eternally, incorruptible and undefiled." But there is yet further evidence of the extent of his departure from the light which God has sent forth "to guide unto His holy hill, and to His tabernacles."

The smooth words of the following extract may captivate some—perhaps many, but they will deceive no priestly ear—no ear that is really touched with "the blood and with the oil" of the sanctuary. The sheep of Christ will not discern in these, and other like words, their Shepherd's voice, but rather the voice of the stranger.

"It will be noticed that in the Hebrew poets the longing for God never strikes one as morbid or unnatural to the men who uttered it. It is as natural to them to long for God as for the swallow to seek her nest. Throughout all their images no suspicion rises within us that they are exaggerating. We feel how truly they are reading themselves—their deepest selves. No false note occurs in all their aspiration. There is no weariness even in their ceaseless sighing, except the lover's weariness for the absent—if they would fly away, it is only to be at rest. Men

Digitized by Google

who have no soul can only wonder at this. Men who have a soul, but with little faith, can only envy it. How joyous a thing it was to the Hebrews to seek their God! How artlessly they call upon Him to entertain them in His pavilion, to cover them with His feathers, to hide them in His secret place, to hold them in the hollow of His hand, or stretch around them the Everlasting arms! These men were true children of Nature. As the humming-bird among its own palm-trees, as the ephemera in the sunshine of a summer evening, so they lived their joyous lives. And even the full share of the sadder experiences of life which came to all of them but drove them the further into the Secret Place, and led them with more consecration to make, as they expressed it, 'the Lord their portion.' All that has been said since, from Marcus Aurelius to Swedenborg, from Augustine to Schleiermacher, of a besetting God as the final complement of humanity is but a repetition of the Hebrew poet's faith. And even the New Testament has nothing higher to offer man than this. The Psalmist's 'God is our refuge and strength,' is only the earlier form, less defined, less practicable, but not less noble, of Christ's 'Come unto ME, and I will give you rest. . . . . The lower departments of Nature are already complete enough. The world itself is about as good a world as might be. It has been long in the making, its furniture is all in, its laws are in perfect working order; and although wise men at various times have suggested improvements, there is on the whole a tolerably unanimous vote of confidence in things as they exist. The Divine environment has little more to do for this planet, so far as we can see, and so far as the existing generation is concerned. Then the lower organic life of the world is also so far complete. God, through Evolution, or otherwise may still have finishing-touches to add here and there, but already it is 'all very good.' It is difficult to conceive

Digitized by Google

anything better of its kind than a lily or a cedar, an ant or an ant-eater. These organisms, so far as we can judge, lack nothing. It might be said of them, 'they are complete in Nature.' Of man also, of man the animal, it may be affirmed that his environment satisfies him. He has food and drink, and good food and good drink. And there is in him no purely animal want which is not really provided for, and that apparently in the happiest possible way." (P. 275—277.)

Are David, the sweet Psalmist of Israel, who said, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue," and "the holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," to be looked on as mere "Hebrew poets"? Are they to be placed in the same circle as Marcus Aurelius, a rejector of Christ—or of Swedenborg, a depraver of morals and of truth and a Spiritualist, or of Schleiermacher, a daring Neologian, who spent his days in warring against revealed truth? And as to "the lower departments of Nature," which Mr. Drummond deems to be "*already complete enough*," did Christ think so? Did Christ think "*the world itself to be about as good a world as might be?*" Mr. Drummond seems to think it a "*very good*" thing for the ant-eater to devour, and the lion to raven, and the tiger to tear. But Christ did not think so. He knew that the whole creation "groaneth and travaileth in pain together." He heard that groan, and hears it still, and waiteth for that coming hour when "the morning with-

Digitized by Google

out clouds" shall dawn. He tells us, and all His inspired servants tell us, that the moral and governmental order of the world have not really improved, but have waxed, and will "wax, worse and worse." But Mr. Drummond is differently minded. He has learned in the School of Science, and his ear is turned away from the voice of "the Scriptures of Truth." On that very condition of human things which he contemplates so complacently, the Prophets and the Apostles of our God and Saviour have pronounced words of "lamentation, and mourning, and woe." The roll which John in Patmos ate—sweet in his mouth, but in his belly bitter (see Rev. x. 10)—Mr. Drummond seems not even to have tasted. "Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord and for the glory of His Majesty. . . . . For the Day of the Lord of Hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up; and he shall be brought low. . . . And they shall go into the holes of the rocks and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His Majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. . . . Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isaiah ii. 10, etc.) This, and like declarations of God's Word, do not seem to imply that "this world is about as good a world as might be." They are, however, in strict har-

Digitized by Google

mony with the words, THE WHOLE WORLD LIETH IN THE WICKED ONE. *Εν τῳ πονηρῳ.* (See 1 John v. 19.)

§ IV.

AT an hour like the present, when there is so great a "withdrawal" from the faith—a withdrawal that will doubtless be, in most cases, a withdrawal "unto perdition," it is more than ever incumbent on all who fear God, to cleave, closely and determinately, to all that He has declared in Holy Scripture respecting Himself, His prerogatives, attributes and acts. The Holy Ghost has called Scripture "the Scripture of Truth," and the Lord ratified this when He said, "The Scripture cannot be broken." If, in the face of these attestations, we refuse to admit the entire truthfulness and authority of Holy Writ, we set ourselves against the Holy Ghost and against Christ, and enrol ourselves among "the adversaries."

Mr. Drummond, unless he abandons the relation which, in this book, he has taken towards the Evolutionists and their theories, must be numbered among the Adversaries. He may yet bethink himself: he may yet repent and turn: but I am speaking now of his present position, and of his present testimony. All Evolutionists deny, and while they continue Evolutionists, *must* deny, that

Digitized by Google

the fifth verse of the second of Genesis is true. We are there told that God created "every plant of the field BEFORE it was in the earth, and every herb of the field BEFORE it grew"; each tree and plant having its seed in itself. (Gen. i. 11 and 12.) The word "BEFORE" (a word which God has written) utterly nullifies every evolutionary theory. All things were created in entirety and perfectness. There was no gradual growth or progression—much less evolution. The earth, at the end of the six days' creation, was complete and fully furnished. It came into being in a condition of matured development, each plant being perfect in its kind, and each containing its seed within itself. If this be true (and it is true, for the Bible has unequivocally declared it) the theories of Evolutionism—even if they were as rational as they are nonsensical—must be utterly rejected. If not, we must reject the Bible, and in rejecting that, we reject God and Christ. There is no alternative.*

Again, I believe, and deem it to be essential to salvation to believe, that God is the Creator of all things, *matter included.* I believe that nothing was eternal, and nothing self-existent, except GOD. Matter was *not* eternal. It was created

* For further observations on this subject, see pamphlet entitled, Remarks on "Mosaic Cosmogony" being the fifth of "Essays and Reviews," by Benjamin Wills Newton. London: Houlston and Son.

Digitized by Google

by God. God not only made the Universe in the sense of forming it: He also caused the matter, out of which it is formed, to come into existence by calling it out of nothing. *To create* in this sense, is the prerogative of God alone. Man can form and fashion: God only can *create*: and this is emphatically taught in the words, "created and made"—more literally, "created to make," *i.e.*, He "created" it, called it out of nothing, in order that He might make it what it now is. Accordingly, we are distinctly taught by the Apostle that the things seen were not made out of phenomena, *i.e.*, out of things previously developed and apparent. (See Hebrews xi. 3.)*

Such is the testimony of Scripture: but what does Mr. Drummond say? He says, "The atoms of which the visible Universe is built up, bear distinct marks of being manufactured articles" (p. 54): and again: "*Ex nihilo nihil*, nothing can be made out of nothing. MATTER IS UNCREATABLE AND INDESTRUCTIBLE." (See p. 297.)

Now, if there be such a thing as "matter" (and no one, I suppose, doubts that), and if it be *uncreatable*, as Mr. Drummond affirms, then it must be self-existent and eternal. God cannot have created it; and therefore He is not the

* Εις το μη εκ φαινομενων το βλεπομενον γεγονεναι. See Tregelles's Greek Text.

Digitized by Google

Creator of all things; nor can He alone be self-existent. Moreover, if matter be "indestructible," He is not omnipotent: consequently, all that the Bible has revealed respecting Him touching these things must be false. Therefore, the Bible must be rejected; and with it, God, who has accredited it. This is the necessary result to which that "Science," to which Mr. Drummond so earnestly directs us as *the re-caster of Truth*, leads. Shall we accredit its teaching? We do accredit it, if we accredit, directly or indirectly, Mr. Drummond's book. This is a question of vital moment; and its determination, one way or the other, will lead to practical results whose importance we cannot at present estimate.

One of Mr. Drummond's admirers says, "Mr. "Drummond takes some of the chief laws of nature "*as they have been discovered and stated by Evolu-* "*tionists*, and demonstrates their identity with those "principles of Christianity which have hitherto been "accepted on authority, but have never been re-"duced to law, or compared with the laws of "nature."* This, no doubt, is Mr. Drummond's attempt. His object (and a sorrowful and evil object it is) is to bridge the gulf which has hitherto separated the follies and infidelity of Evolutionism from Evangelical Truth. It is an

* See quotation from "Spectator," prefixed to Mr. Drummond's Preface.

Digitized by Google

effort to make Moab and Israel one. (See page 243).

"Evolutionists tells us," says Mr. Drummond, "that by the influence of environment certain aquatic animals have become adapted to a terrestrial mode of life. Breathing normally by gills, as the result and reward of a continued effort carried on from generation to generation to inspire the air of heaven direct, they have slowly acquired the lung-function. In the young organism, true to the ancestral type, the gill still persists—as in the tadpole of the common frog. But as maturity approaches, the true lung appears; the gill gradually transfers its task to the higher organ; it then becomes atrophied and disappears, and finally respiration in the adult is conducted by lungs alone. We may be far, in the meantime, from saying that this is proved. It is for those who accept it to deny the justice of the spiritual analogy. Is religion to them unscientific in its doctrine of Regeneration? Will the Evolutionist who admits the regeneration of the frog under the modifying influence of a continued correspondence with a new environment, care to question the possibility of the soul acquiring such a faculty as that of Prayer, the marvellous breathing-function of the new creature, when in contact with the atmosphere of a besetting God? Is the change from the earthly to the heavenly more mysterious than the change from the aquatic to the terrestrial mode of life? Is Evolution to stop with the organic? If it be objected that it has taken ages to perfect the function in the batrachian, the reply is, that it will take ages to perfect the function in the Christian. For every thousand years the natural evolution will allow for the development of its organism, the Higher Biology will grant its product millions. We have, indeed, spoken of the spiritual correspondence as already perfect; but it is perfect only as the bud is perfect. 'It doth

Digitized by Google

not yet appear what it shall be,' any more than it appeared a million years ago what the evolving batrachian would be."

Mr. Drummond manifests in this paragraph a certain degree of misgiving as to the evolutionary system. If he could be induced to break the deadly bond wherewith he has been bound—if he would renounce the lying system by which he has been bewitched, and would bow to the Bible, and cease to trifle about batrachianism, or frog-evolutionary developments *a million years ago*, and would humbly own God as the Creator of all things, and receive the account that the Bible gives of the earth's age and of the earth's creation, he might yet be delivered. But if he refuses to do this, and persists in saying what he here says, that "for every thousand years the natural evolution will allow for the development of its organism, the Higher Biology will grant its product millions," there can be no hope. The Scripture will be abandoned. The result is obvious.

Again, Mr. Drummond quotes with approval the following words of a German writer—Reuss, who, after putting forward his theory respecting eternal life (which he declares to be Apostolic), says, it "leads to a doctrine of immortality, or, to speak more correctly, of life, far surpassing any that had been expressed in the formulas of the current philosophy or *theology*, and resting

Digitized by Google

upon premises and conceptions altogether different." He proceeds to say, that his theory "can dis-"pense both with the philosophical thesis of the "*immateriality or indestructibility of the human* "*soul, and with the theological thesis of a mira-*"*culous corporeal reconstruction of our person;* the "first of which is altogether foreign to the religion "of the Bible, and the second absolutely opposed "to reason."* (P. 236.)

Here, then, I am asked to accept the doctrine of "Conditional Immortality," and to renounce the doctrine of *the eternal existence of the soul*, and also the doctrine of *the Resurrection of the body*—the one being, it is said, *not taught in Scripture*, the other being *irrational.* I reply, Neither are irrational; and they are both taught in Scripture. The awful words written at the end of "the Revelation" respecting those who either add to it, or take from it, are applicable also to those who so treat other parts of the word of God. That which is written in Genesis, and that which is written in "the Revelation," is alike the testimony of GOD. Happy are they who shall be convinced of this before it is too late. There are "willings (*θεληματα*) of the mind" as well as of the flesh (see Eph. ii. 3); and of all *θεληματα* those of the mind *are most to be dreaded*, for they bring into "the seat of

* The italics are mine.

Digitized by Google

the scorner," and lead men to sit in judgment upon God. If practical sanctification be sought, we must seek that "every thought should be brought into the obedience of Christ." That cannot be if the soul refuses to bow to all the declarations of the Word of God.

§ V.

"THE Spiritual World," says Mr. Drummond, "as it stands, is full of perplexity. One can "escape doubt only by escaping thought. . . . . "The old ground of faith—authority—is given up, "the new—Science—has not yet taken its place. "Men did not require to SEE Truth before; they "only needed to believe it."

This statement, even if it stood alone, is sufficient to mark the character of this book. "We walk by faith, not by sight" is the very motto of Christianity. Mr. Drummond supersedes it, and says Science will give you something better. It will enable you to walk *by sight.* Do not be satisfied with leaning on the authority of God's Word, trusting to His promises and His testimonies. Be like the Jews who demanded a sign, or the Greeks who sought after wisdom and required SIGHT. It is said of Abraham that "against hope he believed in hope." What he saw gave him no hope: what he believed in, gave him

Digitized by Google

all hope. The law that guided him was not natural, but *contra*-natural. He believed in One who "raiseth the dead, and calleth the things that are not as though they were." Solomon who had more knowledge (and that by God's gift) of nature and natural law than all the philosophers that have ever been or ever shall be, did not make Natural Law our hope. On the contrary, he tells us that there was "no new thing under the sun," (and therefore no evolution): that "all is vanity and vexation of spirit;" that "crooked things cannot be made straight;" and that "things that are wanting cannot be numbered." But in the Spiritual World—the New Creation, we find another Law, supernatural and contra-natural. Things crooked (and which according to Natural Law would have ever remained crooked) are to be made straight; and things that, according to Natural Law would be for ever wanting, will be supplied. This the coming reign of our God and Saviour will make manifest; and for that we wait, according to the sure promise of His Written Word.

Mr. Drummond looks down with a sort of indulgent pity on "the New Testament writers," as he calls them. I will quote his words.

"It is impossible that the New Testament writers should have been familiar with these biological facts. It is impossible that their views of this great truth [Regeneration] should have been as clear as Science can make them now. But they had no alternative. There was no other way of expressing

Digitized by Google

this truth. It was a biological question. So they struck out unhesitatingly into the new field of words, and with an originality that commands both reverence and surprise, stated their truth with such light or darkness [!!] as they had. They did not mean to be scientific, only to be accurate, and their fearless accuracy has made them scientific. One must confess (he continues) that the originality of this entire New Testament conception is most startling." (P. 295.)

Thus Mr. Drummond speaks of the Apostles of our God and Saviour—men who wrote as they "were moved by the Holy Ghost." In his sight they are but dwarfs, in comparison with the philosophic giants of the nineteenth century. When the Evolutionists speak, the Apostles must bow. The Evolutionists can tell us about minerals born "from above" (*ανωθεν*) and drawn up into the vegetable world of life. The Apostles knew nothing of this. Truly they did not: they would not have been the Apostles of Christ if they had, for no such knowledge comes from Him, or from Heaven. Its origin must be sought elsewhere. It is very evident that no one who can think and write of the Scriptures as Mr. Drummond has here done, can regard them as being what God declares them to be, HIS WORD—true in all things, and alone authoritative.

That Mr. Drummond does not so regard them is sufficiently proved by what has been already said. I will, however, give you a few more examples of discrepancy between his statements and those of Scripture.

Digitized by Google

Speaking of the Spiritual World, Mr. Drummond says:—

"Living in the Spiritual World is just as simple as living in the Natural World; and it is the same kind of simplicity. It is the same kind of, simplicity, for it is the same kind of world—there are not two kinds of worlds." (P. 257.)

The Scripture, however, teaches us that there are two kinds of worlds, even as there are two Adams—the earthly and the Heavenly. And as there is a difference between the earthly and now fallen Adam, and the Second Man who is the Head of the New Creation of God, and whose glory is such that when John saw it he fell at His feet as dead, so there is a corresponding difference between the two creations of which they are the respective Heads. Accordingly, I read in the Scripture such words as these:—"So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second

Digitized by Google

man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

The contrast here is infinite. There will be a corresponding difference between the Adamic Universe, and the New Heavens and New Earth in which the Spiritual World will find the appointed sphere of its development. There, flesh and blood cannot enter. The old things (Natural Law included) will have passed away. "He that sat upon the Throne said: Behold, I make all things NEW."

As Mr. Drummond declines to believe in the resurrection of the body, the testimony of the

Digitized by Google

Apostle will to him, of course, be valueless. He quotes as the chosen motto of one of his chapters, these words of Emerson:—"When I talked with "an ardent missionary, and pointed out to him "that his creed found no support in my experience, "he replied: 'It is not so in your experience, but "it is so in the other world.' I answer: 'Other "world! There is no other world. God is one "and omnipresent; here or nowhere is the whole fact.'" (Page 251.)

Are we, then, to be Pantheists? Does the fact that God is, in respect of His knowledge, power and agency, everywhere present, destroy the equally patent fact that His dwelling-place is Heaven? Are we not taught to say, "Our Father, *which art in Heaven*"? Are "Heaven" and "Hell" names that indicate, not localities, but merely different conditions of moral being? This is the thought of the party to which Mr. Drummond belongs, and, apparently, it is *his* thought, for in speaking of Sin as that which separates from God, he says, "THIS IS HELL"* (p. 169).

---

* His words are "Sin, that which separates from God, which disobeys God, which *can* not in that state correspond with God—*this is Hell*." So, also, in page 103, he speaks of "*the hell of a neglected life*"—and that, when speaking avowedly of the *conclusion* of a man's course, for he says that the gravitation of sin "LANDS" him "in the hell of a neglected life." Nor is it possible that Mr. Drummond should believe

Digitized by Google

Whatever explanation, therefore, different individuals may give of the statement—"THERE IS NO OTHER WORLD," it is evident that all who adopt those awful words must refuse to recognise the greatest of all the distinctions made known to us in the Word of God, namely, the distinction between the first earthy man in his corruption, and the second man, the last Adam,

---

what the Scripture reveals respecting Hades and Gehenna (Hell) as localities, whilst he retains the thoughts enunciated in the words that follow. He says (p. 222), "Emotion, volition, thought itself, are functions of the brain. When the brain is impaired, they are impaired. When the brain is not, they are not. Everything ceases with the dissolution of the material fabric; muscular activity and mental activity perish alike. With the pronounced positive statements on this point from many departments of modern Science we are all familiar. The fatal verdict is recorded by a hundred hands, and with scarcely a shadow of qualification. 'Unprejudiced philosophy is compelled to reject the idea of an individual immortality and of a personal continuance after death. With the decay and dissolution of its material substratum, through which alone it has acquired a conscious existence and become a person, and upon which it was dependent, the spirit must cease to exist.' To the same effect Vogt: 'Physiology decides definitely and categorically against individual immortality, as against any special existence of the soul. The soul does not enter the fœtus like the evil spirit into persons possessed, but is a product of the development of the brain, just as muscular activity is a product of muscular development, and secretion a product of glandular development.'"

Digitized by Google

whose glory is the glory of the only-begotten Son of God. The Adamic world is adapted to one who is earthy: the New Creation, to One who is from Heaven. Are they identical? Do the same laws prevail in both? If so, the first and the Second Man must be *essentially* the same. Philosophy may say so: but the Scripture saith otherwise.

No hindrance that, however, to Mr. Drummond's saying:

"The spiritual world is simply the outermost segment, circle, or circles, of the natural world. For purposes of convenience we separate the two, just as we separate the animal world from the plant. But the animal world and the plant world are the same world. They are different parts of one environment. And the natural and spiritual are likewise one. The inner circles are called the natural, the outer the spiritual." (P. 157.)

Is this what John felt when he saw his Lord in Glory? Is this what John and all the other Saints will feel when, in the twinkling of an eye, they shall be changed into their Lord's likeness, and enter into the Glory of the resurrection-morn? But Mr. Drummond thinks with Reuss, that the "miraculous corporeal re-construction of our persons" is something "absolutely opposed to reason," and he can "dispense" with it; that is, he can dispense with the Resurrection.

Digitized by Google

§ VI.

We have seen the opinions of Mr. Drummond concerning the protoplasm of Man Natural: we have now to consider his sentiments concerning the origin and protoplasm of Man Spiritual. His views are thus given :—

"We should be forsaking the lines of nature were we to imagine for a moment that the new creature was to be formed out of nothing. *Ex nihilo nihil*—nothing can be made out of nothing. Matter is uncreatable and indestructible; Nature and man can only form and transform. Hence when a new animal is made, no new clay is made. Life merely enters into already existing matter, assimilates more of the same sort and rebuilds it. The spiritual Artist works in the same way. He must have a peculiar kind of protoplasm, a basis of life, and that must be already existing.

"Now He finds this in the materials of character with which the natural man is previously provided. Mind and character, the will and the affections, the moral nature—these form the bases of spiritual life. To look in this direction for the protoplasm of the spiritual life is consistent with all analogy. The lowest or mineral world mainly supplies the material—and this is true even for insectivorous species—for the vegetable kingdom. The vegetable supplies the material for the animal. Next in turn, the animal furnishes material for the mental; and, lastly, the mental for the spiritual. Each member of the series is complete only when the steps below it are complete; the highest demands all. It is not necessary for the immediate purpose to go so far into the psychology either of the new creature or of the old as to define more clearly what these moral bases are. It is enough to discover that

Digitized by Google

in this womb the new creature is to be born, fashioned out of the mental and moral parts, substance, or essence of the natural man." (Page 297.)

It would be difficult, I think, throughout all the records of human thought, to find a more extraordinary statement than this. "The new creature," says Mr. Drummond, "is to be born, fashioned out of *the mental and moral parts, substance, or essence of the natural man:*" these mental and moral parts having (together with our material substance) been evolved from inferior organisms—the mineral rising into the vegetable, and then the vegetable into the animal, the animal next in turn furnishing materials for the mental, and lastly the mental for the spiritual. "In this womb the new creature is "to be born, fashioned out of the mental and moral "parts, substance, or essence of the natural man."

Now the Holy Ghost in the Scripture designates these "mental and moral parts" of our natural being, by the well-known expression, φρονημα σαρκος—"mind of the flesh," and tells us that this "mind of the flesh," all that mentally and morally characterises our natural being, is "enmity against God:" that it "is not subject to the Law of God, NEITHER INDEED CAN BE." Yet I am asked by Mr. Drummond's SCIENCE to believe that out of these elements of evil (hopelessly and essentially antagonistic to God) the new creature is to be born and fashioned. Certainly I can understand that light may be formed in the midst of

Digitized by Google

darkness, and that darkness may thereby be supplanted, but I have never heard of darkness either evolving or supplying the elements out of which light is "born and fashioned." *Καινη διδαχη*,—"a new doctrine" truly; but one not found in the Word of God.

"The old man," or "the flesh," is another expression used in Scripture to describe the character of my mental and moral natural being. I am told that "the old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," and that instead of being "the basis" of the new man, or supplying to it any of its own moral characteristics (which could only be evil), it remains, even after the new man has been "created" in us, hostile thereunto, and ceaselessly warring with it. Of the flesh it is said, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit (and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are set in array [*αντικειμενα*] the one against the other), in order that ye might not do the things that ye would." This is something very different from the doctrine of Mr. Drummond, who would have us believe that the old and the new become blended into a moral concord of blessedness that culminates in perfectness of holiness and glory. Corruption, it is true, may *give place* to incorruption, and Death may be "*swallowed up*," but I have never heard of corruption evolving incorruption, or of moral death supplying the elements of spiritual life.

The fact is that no School of Philosophy what-

Digitized by Google

soever (least of all the Evolutionary School) has any conception of the Fall of man, or of its consequences. The Evolutionists believe that matter has inherently connected with it a law of progress, whereby it is ever tending upwards; and that a law is found operating in the moral nature of man, causing it to tend towards God. The very reverse is the truth. Fallen human nature gravitates away from God. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" All are "by nature children of wrath," they "are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies." "In me, that is, in my flesh," said the Apostle, "dwelleth no good thing." "There is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God." "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin."

"Sin in the flesh" is the characteristic name of fallen humanity; and certainly no element of good can be supplied out of that. No basis for the holiness of the new creation can be found there. The one word CIRCUMCISION is sufficient to prove that; for circumcision indicates not change or improvement, but a cutting off and setting aside. The flesh is to be severed. Corruption has no "correspondency" with incorruption. The word REGENERATION too teaches the same thing. It implies that a previous condition of being is laid aside, and another condition of being assumed. Evolution, and all its theories, perish before these

Digitized by Google

two words—"Circumcision" and "Regeneration;" and they are God's words.

But Mr. Drummond heeds none of these things. In giving his reasons why this spiritual life "should not be engrafted upon the intelligence of a dog, or the instincts of an ant," he writes as follows :—

"The protoplasm in man has a something in addition to its instincts or its habits. It has a capacity for God. In this capacity for God lies its receptivity; it is the very protoplasm that was necessary. The chamber is not only ready to receive the new Life, but the Guest is expected, and, till He comes, is missed. Till then the soul longs and yearns, wastes and pines, waving its tentacles piteously in the empty air, feeling after God if so be that it may find Him. This is not peculiar to the protoplasm of the Christian's soul. In every land and in every age there have been altars to the Known or Unknown God. It is now agreed as a mere question of anthropology that the universal language of the human soul has always been, 'I perish with hunger.' This is what fits it for Christ. There is a grandeur in this cry from the depths which makes its very unhappiness sublime." (Page 300.)

Does Mr. Drummond see no difference between the fretful restlessness of a dissatisfied soul seeking happiness in phantoms, and a soul that truly "seeketh after" God? Does he see no difference between the condition of the prodigal, when his back was turned upon his father's house, and his condition when he said, "I will return unto my father, and say, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son"? No words like these ever

Digitized by Google

came from an *unquickened* soul. No unquickened soul ever sought after God. Of all others it is said, "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God." Mr. Drummond, however, is differently minded. He affirms that the soul of man naturally "longs, yearns, wastes and pines" after God. He finds the "protoplasm" of the new creation in that in which God sees the very essentiality of evil.

§ VII.

IT is very evident that all who refuse the statements of God in Scripture as *axiomatic*, requiring no proofs except the fact that they are found in Scripture, will never have any certainty in religious things. To such all Theology must be in a state of irremediable confusion, or (to use Mr. Drummond's expression) "flux."

In philosophic subjects, too, it is equally evident that all who, not content with confining themselves to the discovery and registration of facts, insist on accounting for those facts, will soon find themselves in a sea of doubt. Their uncertainties will increase just in proportion as the sphere of their knowledge widens. Experience also shows, that the ambitious desire of proving a speculative theory, has caused not a few to yield to the temptation of *assuming* unproved facts. Thus in

Digitized by Google

the Evolutionary School, it was, a little while ago, asserted, and by many believed, that all the links in the supposed chain of evolutionary succession were complete. Now, it is admitted that those between the Ape and Man are wanting. Spontaneous vivification, too, was asserted: now it has been found to be a fiction. Evolutionary theories, therefore, are, on their own showing, in a state of "flux"; and certainly laws, or supposed laws that work disorder in their *own* sphere, cannot work order in *another*. It must be remembered too, that although the sphere of Religious Truth is not the same as that of Natural Truth, and although it is true that the object of Scripture is to reveal Religious and not Natural Truth, yet it is equally true that when the Scripture does enter the sphere of Natural Truth and speak of any thing comprised therein, its words are to be received with reverence and unqualified submission. In the case of all who fear God, the sphere of their investigations will be limited in many ways. They will deem it unlawful and sinful to receive as fact anything that the Word of God declares not to be fact—even though it should seem to be proved by ocular demonstration. Thus, I have heard it asserted *by some*, that microscopic observation has proved that the germ of life in a seed sown never becomes extinct, but that it continues to exist and germinate without the intervention of even momentary death. In that case the words

Digitized by Google

of the Apostle, "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die," would be nullified. Nor even if microscopic observation should seem to discredit the words of the Apostle (I do not affirm that it does), yet I should still adhere to the testimony of Scripture, and say that it is one instance out of many, in which the operations of God elude detection by the most minute examinations of man. Moreover, when God has declared anything to be *impossible*, it is not lawful for us any longer to inquire whether it be *possible*. Under this head will come all inquiries respecting the existence of pre-Adamite man. God decided that question the moment He used the words, "*First* Adam"—"*First* Man." Nor can any disquisition be other than sinful which ignores that which He has in Genesis, or elsewhere, written, respecting the time, order, and mode of "Creation." In Job, the Proverbs, and elsewhere, He has oft-times declared that His ways are in respect of these things "unsearchable." "We know in part, and we prophesy in part." Bearing this in mind, let us now read the following observations of Mr. Drummond.

"If we analyse this material point at which all life starts, we shall find it to consist of a clear structureless-jelly-like substance resembling albumen or white of egg. It is made of Carbon, Hydrogen, Oxygen, and Nitrogen. Its name is Protoplasm. And it is not only the structural unit with which all living bodies start in life, but with which they are subsequently built up. 'Protoplasm,' says Huxley, 'simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of all life.

Digitized by Google

It is the clay of the Potter.' 'Beast and fowl, reptile and fish, mollusk, worm and polype are all composed of structural units of the same character, namely, masses of protoplasm with a nucleus.'

"What then determines the difference between different animals? What makes one little speck of protoplasm grow into Newton's dog Diamond, and another, exactly the same, into Newton himself? It is a mysterious something which has entered into this protoplasm. No eye can see it. No science can define it. There is a different something for Newton's dog, and a different something for Newton; so that though both use the same matter they build it up in these widely different ways. Protoplasm being the clay, this something is the Potter. And as there is only one clay, and yet all these curious forms are developed out of it, it follows necessarily that the difference lies in the potters. There must, in short, be as many potters as there are forms. There is the potter who segments the worm, and the potter who builds up the form of the dog, and the potter who moulds the man. To understand unmistakably that it is really the potter who does the work, let us follow for a moment a description of the process by a trained eye-witness. The observer is Mr. Huxley. Through the tube of his microscope he is watching the development, out of a speck of protoplasm, of one of the commonest animals: 'Strange possibilities,' he says, 'lie dormant in that semi-fluid globule. Let a moderate supply of warmth reach its watery cradle and the plastic matter undergoes changes so rapid, and yet so steady and purpose-like in their succession, that one can only compare them to those operated by a skilled modeller upon a formless lump of clay. As with an invisible trowel, the mass is divided and subdivided into smaller and smaller portions, until it is reduced to an aggregation of granules not too large to build withal the finest fabrics of the nascent organism. And, then, it is as

Digitized by Google

if a delicate finger traced out the line to be occupied by the spinal column, and moulded the contour of the body; pinching up the head at one end, the tail at the other, and fashioning flank and limb into due proportions in so artistic a way, that, after watching the process hour by hour, one is almost involuntarily possessed by the notion that some more subtle aid to vision than an achromatic would show the hidden artist, with his plan before him, striving with skilful manipulation to perfect his work.

"Besides the fact, so luminously brought out here, that the artist is distinct from the 'semi-fluid globule' of protoplasm in which he works, there is this other essential point to notice, that in all his 'skilful manipulation' the artist is not working at random, but according to law. He has 'his plan before him.' In the zoological laboratory of Nature it is not as in a workshop, where a skilled artisan can turn his hand to anything—where the same potter one day moulds a dog, the next a bird, and the next a man. In Nature one potter is set apart to make each. It is a more complete system of division of labour. One artist makes all the dogs, another makes all the birds, a third makes all the men. Moreover, each artist confines himself exclusively to the working out of his own plan. He appears to have his own plan somehow stamped upon himself, and his work is rigidly to reproduce himself.

"The Scientific Law by which this takes place is the Law of Conformity to Type. It is contained, to a large extent, in the ordinary Law of Inheritance; or it may be considered as simply another way of stating what Darwin calls the Law of Unity of Type. Darwin defines it thus: 'By Unity of Type is meant that fundamental agreement in structure which we see in organic beings of the same class, and which is quite independent of their habits of life.' According to this law every living thing that comes into the world is compelled to stamp upon its offspring the

Digitized by Google

image of itself. The dog, according to its type, produces a dog; the bird, a bird.

"The Artist who operates upon matter in this subtle way and carries out this law is Life. There are a great many different kinds of Life. If one might give the broader meaning to the words of the Apostle: 'All life is not the same life. There is one kind of life of men, another life of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.'* There is the Life, or the Artist, or the Potter who segments the worm, the potter who forms the dog, the potter who moulds the man.

"What goes on then in the animal kingdom is this—The Bird-Life seizes upon the bird-germ and builds it up into a bird, the image of itself. The Reptile-Life seizes upon another germinal speck, assimilates surrounding matter, and fashions it into a reptile. The Reptile-Life thus simply makes an incarnation of itself. The visible bird is simply an incarnation of the invisible Bird-Life.

"Now we are nearing the point where the spiritual analogy appears. It is a very wonderful analogy, so wonderful that one almost hesitates to put it into words. Yet Nature is reverent; and it is her voice to which we listen. These lower phenomena of life, she says, are but an allegory. There is another kind of life of which Science as yet has taken little cognisance. It obeys the same laws. It builds up an organism into its own form. It is the Christ-Life. As the Bird-Life builds up a bird, the image of itself, so the Christ-Life builds up a Christ, the image of Himself, in the inward nature of a man."

The manner in which this narrative is given

---

*Where does the Apostle say there are different kinds of Life? He says "all flesh is not the same flesh," but that is quite another matter.

Digitized by Google

tempts to the use of ridicule: but the desire must be restrained. When the laws which are *supposed* to regulate the elevation of a mineral into the higher sphere of vegetable existence (an elevation which, if it ever had taken place would have violated every law that has been stamped upon matter from the first moment of its existence)—when such laws are supposed to be identical with the laws that regulate the regeneration of a sinner, and when a mineral so elevated is described as being born "from above," our sense of the egregious folly of the statement must be merged in the thought of the responsibility incurred by the promulgation of a doctrine so anti-Scriptural and so false. Let us seek, therefore, to treat the matter with a seriousness becoming its solemnity. I would first observe that Mr. Drummond *professes* to treat of "the material point at which *all life starts*," whereas he treats not of that point at all. If he had, he must have gone back to the time when CREATIVE power was first manifested, and described the first actings of God in CREATING out of nothing—a time when there were no organized or vitalized existences, and when there was no matter out of which such existences could be formed. That was the period at which "life started." But of that period he tells us nothing. He speaks only of the operation of certain energies (which he calls Life or Lives) supposed to be employed in sustaining and perpetuating an

Digitized by Google

existent creation; but respecting the originisation of that creation he tells us nothing. Will any one affirm that the manner in which God made "every plant of the field BEFORE it was in the earth, and every herb of the field BEFORE it grew," was identical with the manner in which He now continues the production of vegetable and animal life? Were Adam and Eve created in the same manner in which their descendants are? Evolutionists may evade the question because they wish not to confront the Scripture; for well they know that their statements and those of the Scripture are irreconcilably at variance. An Evolutionist who desires to hide this discrepancy must be sorely tried by all that Scripture says respecting the creation of EVE, and how God Himself breathed into Adam the breath of life; and how all things when created were ushered into existence complete in all the constitution of their being — God being the Author of that being in all its parts, God originating everything (matter included), and matter, lifeless matter, originating nothing. If these things had been believed, we should have heard none of those offensive expressions with which the extract I have quoted teems. We should have heard nothing about the operations of the "dog-life," and the "bird-life," and the "reptile-life," and the "man-life," one "artist" (the "dog-life") being described as making all the dogs; and another "artist" (the "bird-life") as

Digitized by Google

making all the birds; and another "artist" (the "man-life") as making all the men. Is life an artist? Are there many artists? Is not God the One personal communicator of life (ὁ ζωοποιων) and the One sustainer and controller of all the developments of such life after it is communicated? He, and He only, is the artist. Why then this Personification and Deification of an energy that they are pleased to call "Life"? Are we to have Gnosticism and Æonism again? Alexandrian Gnosticism and Pantheism of old taught follies such as these, and for a time God bore with them, but the hour of vengeance came at last, as the history of the seventh century shows. An hour of vengeance far more terrible awaits us now. This the visions of "The Revelation" attest to all who "have ears to hear."

To a Christian who reverences the Scripture, the whole story of Evolution is revolting. It contradicts Scripture: it contradicts fact. Can any one who is not beside himself believe that a gaseous principle goes on evolving one knows not what, until at last, the mineral being evolved, evolves in its turn the vegetable, and the vegetable the animal, and so forth? Certainly this is not the way in which God either created or creates. His Scripture puts its *veto* on it absolutely: and that is enough for every one who fears Him. But if men appeal to facts, where are the facts? Did any man see the

Digitized by Google

mineral cast off its nature and assume that of the vegetable, or the vegetable cast off its nature, and assume that of a brute, or a brute cast off its nature and assume that of a man endowed with moral and intellectual powers? No sane man would ever affirm that he had witnessed such changes. Yet such a progression could not have advanced unnoticed. Higher organisations stooping down and absorbing lower ones would be the rule of man's day. It was very convenient, no doubt, for the advocates of these things to talk about "spontaneous life." If there could have been spontaneous life, there might have been spontaneous anything. But now all are obliged to acknowledge that there is no such thing as "spontaneous life." This confession places them in a sad dilemma. Even if they pretend to have "uncreated [!!] matter," they are without "artists," or "lives," to operate upon this matter, unless they assert (and to this, apparently, the system is tending) that the hidden "artists" are virtually Æons—evolved independent spiritual existences, about whom enough was heard (see Irenæus) in the early ages. Persons who choose to guess and imagine *agencies*, can guess and imagine just what they please. No serious argument is in such case possible. Self-contradiction will, of course, abound. Thus in the case before us. It may be asked if, in order to effect the elevation of a mineral into a vegetable, there must be evolution from the

Digitized by Google

mineral to produce the higher, but as yet non-existent, vegetable; and if it be also necessary that a power should come down from the non-existent vegetable to assist or stimulate the evolution from the mineral, how could the vegetable, which has no existence until the evolution from the mineral has taken place, supply, whilst non-existent, the stimulating or attracting power needed? The initiated in evolutionary mysteries may have some secret means of replying to such questions, but as for me, I refuse to believe that non-existences can be invested with the functions and properties of existences. If no distinction is to be drawn between that which IS, and that which IS NOT, we may as well cease to reason. As I have already said, I see no means of solving such a question as this, except by recurring to the old device of Æons, and asserting that there are unseen evolved spiritual existences that divide among themselves the attributes and the powers of "the One Living and true God." No doubt there is a tendency in one blasphemy to evolve another, and this can easily be accounted for when we remember that there is an unseen world of spirits, whose energies are devoted to the propagation of thoughts and systems dishonouring to God, subversive of Truth, and destructive of souls. Physical Evolution, under their control, may be expected to culminate in Spiritual Evolution; and pretended Laws, which have subverted God's order in the

Digitized by Google

Natural Sphere, may be carried on to produce like confusion in the Spiritual.

There is yet one further question I would like to ask. Evolutionists wish us to believe that, in the Natural World, each higher organization is indebted for its existence and for its power of action to the lower organization proximate to it from which it is evolved. Is this so in the Spiritual World also? Is that which they are pleased to call the "Christ-life" inoperative or non-existent, until evolution has taken place from the organization supposed to be below it? I suppose few would venture on such an assertion. Yet, if it be not so, every shadow of resemblance between the supposed Law in the Natural Sphere and the supposed Law in the Spiritual Sphere vanishes. I hope I have not misrepresented anything. If I have, it must be pardoned, and attributed to my dulness: for I am not initiated.

§ VIII.

NATURAL Law once found the sphere of its operation in a Paradisiacal Earth where all was perfect, and all was blessed—curse, sorrow, and groan being unknown. But all this is changed. The sphere of its operation now is in a ruined earth, of which Satan is the *κοσμοκρατωρ*—where Creation is subjected "to the bondage of corruption," and where

Digitized by Google

"the foundations of all things are out of course." Whatever progression there may be — whatever development, the result is the same. All is "vanity and vexation of spirit" — "man born to sorrow as the sparks fly upward." By one man's disobedience "Sin entered, and Death through Sin." The present governmental relation of Man to God is given in the words, "Judgment came upon all men to condemnation." The infliction of the pronounced sentence may be, and is delayed, but the end is sure; and that end is the "lake burning with fire and brimstone, which is the Second Death." Can any basis for the NEW CREATION be found in, or evolved from, anything that morally belongs to a circle such as this?

True Natural Law, as known by God, is based on the awful fact that a gulph impassable by the creature, separates fallen man from God. A barrier of fire confronts us. Nature cannot pass it. To us belongs not moral disease merely, but CRIMINALITY: to God belong Holiness and Judgment. "I am a great King, saith the Lord of Hosts;" and the Laws of a great King must be vindicated and maintained. Can Natural Law effect any thing in the presence of facts like these? Natural Law must needs be silent in the presence of Nature's ruin. "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly.

Digitized by Google

I beheld, and lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger." (Jer. iv. 23.) Such is the end to which all Natural Law brings: such the portion of all that trust therein. Darkness can supply no elements to Light. Where Light comes, darkness perishes.

There could have been no hope—with Nature and with Natural Law we must have perished, if God had not intervened. But God has intervened. "Behold I create A NEW THING in the earth," are the words in which He announces His intervention. "Behold I create A NEW THING in the earth, a weak woman [נְקֵבָה] shall enclose a mighty one [גָּבֶר]." Such is the promise that was given by Him who alone knoweth the extent and vastness of the contrast implied in the words נְקֵבָה and גָּבֶר "weak woman" and "Mighty One." This promise was at Bethlehem fulfilled. There *He* was born "whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting." The hosts of Heaven heralded His birth with songs of thanksgiving, and the wise of earth drew nigh and worshipped. He was emphatically a *new* Thing in the earth; for His Coming, His Birth, His Person and His Offices, were all above and beyond the rules of Natural Law. We find ourselves within a circle, where, because of the presence of One in whom "dwell-

Digitized by Google

eth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," the limitations of earth give place, or else adapt themselves unto, the presence of Omnipotence. Within *this* circle—not in the Natural circle—we seek and find the basis of the new Creation of God.

The great and infinitely important fact that His humanity physically was, as to all its *essentialities*, like that of His brethren, did not take from His Person its *newness:* for His humanity, as to its *moral* characteristics and condition, altogether differed from that of His brethren, seeing that it was as unchangeably pure and holy as theirs is vicious and corrupt. His miraculous conception through the power of the Holy Ghost, gave to His humanity moral characteristics that contrast utterly with ours. Consequently, by the Incarnation, no link was formed with the old moral natural condition of man. And not only so: the humanity assumed by the Holy One was brought into eternal and inseparable personal union with the Godhead: so that the very fact that He was what no other was or could be—God and Man in one Person, gave to that Person a distinctiveness that did indeed require that He should be recognised as NEW—so NEW that no one excepting God, understandeth all that that NEWNESS involves. "No one knoweth the Son but the Father."

"In Him was LIFE"—life in that sense in which we ascribe it unto the Living God—life

Digitized by Google

that Adam in innocency had not—life that angels in their glory have not. In the power of this Life He came. This, philosophic Christianity is sometimes willing, in general terms, to acknowledge, if only it be admitted that the result of His thus coming was the *impartation* of this life to men. Impartation is a word which they for the most part readily welcome, for it conveys a thought that fits into their systems well. But it cannot be too carefully remembered that the Son by His Incarnation imparted Life to no man. The fact of His Incarnation brought Him into union with no man. Men as men were as truly separate from the Holiness of the Son Incarnate as they had been from the Holiness of the Son in glory. He stood in the midst of a fallen world as the Living One (ὁ ζων), separate and alone. His first object in coming into the earth was not to impart unto men, but to act towards God. The unanswered claims of God were to be satisfied, and the glory of His holiness to be maintained. His holiness had been outraged by transgression; that transgression had entailed wrath, and that wrath needed to be appeased. In a word, God's Holiness required that His Law should be glorified by a perfect obedience being rendered, and by all incurred penalties being adequately borne. This man knew not: this Jesus knew, and therefore He came, saying, "Lo, I come to do THY WILL, O God. . . . . By the which WILL

Digitized by Google

we [the household of faith] are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." (Heb. x. 9, 10.) The hallowment, therefore, of His believing people by His sacrificial service and oblation, was the first great object proposed to Himself by the Lord Jesus when He came as "the Surety" to obey and to suffer for His people.

Certainly if the New Creature could have "been fashioned out of the mental and moral parts, substance, or essence of the natural man" (such are Mr. Drummond's words) the miraculous Conception of our God and Saviour would never have been appointed. He was conceived by the Holy Ghost in order that all that *morally* characterised natural man might be excluded from His holy Person; seeing the moral depravation of our being brought into us those "lusts or willings (*θελήματα*) of the flesh and of the mind," which, summed up in the expression *φρονημα σαρκος*, mark the moral condition of our being as one of hopeless "enmity against God." The Incarnation of the Holy One drew a line of separation, clear, definite and eternal, between Him and everything that morally characterised natural man—a line which Natural Law cannot pass—a line that eternally separates the New Creation from the Old. The mental and moral parts, substance or essence of the natural man constituted that very "darkness" in the midst of which the Eternal Son—the Life that was with

Digitized by Google

the Father—the true Candlestick of the Sanctuary, shone. "The Light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not." Nothing, therefore, could be more marked than the contrast between that Holy One who only among men had not the φρονημα σαρκος, and all others. He might have lived in the power of His own essential holiness, have magnified the Law by His obedience, and have returned in blessedness to Heaven. "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels?" (Matt. xxvi. 53.) God would have been honoured, but His people would have been lost; and the special work of "the Surety"—that work which Jesus avowedly came to perform—would have been unaccomplished. *That* was impossible: "the Scripture could not be broken." It was needful, therefore, that He should die. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, IT ABIDETH ALONE, but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." The Lord Jesus might have *abided alone* in the separateness of His own perfectness and glory: but He came in order that He might *not* abide alone. He came to deliver others, and to bring them into association with Himself in the New Creation of God. But in order to deliver it was necessary that He should die—die a judicial death under wrath. The corn of wheat must "DIE."

They whom the Lord Jesus came to deliver

Digitized by Google

(that is, His believing people) had the φρονημα σαρκος — sin in the flesh — "the old man corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Such are the names by which God has designated that living leprosy which morally marks the being of man natural. Did the Lord Jesus find in this plague-stricken condition any tokens of life? Were any healthful elements discernible in it, or ready to be evolved from it? Did He find anything in it that He could make the protoplasm or basis of the New Creature? No: He found in it that which was accursed, and under the sentence of wrath. He approached it indeed, but He brought to it no life; nor was there from it any evolution of life or correspondency with Him. It brought to Him neither life, nor anything meet for association with life. It brought to Him *penal death* —death *under curse.* Though personally unpenetrated, and incapable of being penetrated by the evil of His people, He as the Surety took upon His Holy Person the responsibilities of their evil, and suffered in their room. Thus "the mental and moral parts, substance or essence of the natural man," so far from being drawn up into association with "the Christ-life" in the New Creation, did, on the contrary, meet, on the Cross of the Holy One, with fiery wrath and indignation from the hand of God. What can be more plain or more decisive than the words, "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for

Digitized by Google

sin, damned * (κατεκρινε) sin in the flesh"—that is, *our* sin in the flesh, *our* φρονημα σαρκος. On the Cross the philosophic protoplasm of the New Creature was visited with wrath, and placed under καταργησις and αθετησις for ever. Hence our deliverance and salvation.

God, in the riches of His grace, has been pleased to associate His people with the results of the sacrificial death of His Son. That death not only gave us immunity from wrath; it did more: it brought to us also the value of its own meritorious excellency. The blood was not only "shed," it was "offered" also as a sacrifice of sweet savour on the altar. Viewed in association with the death of our Substitute, we not only see ourselves cut off from all the responsibilities of our former condition of being, but we find ourselves, in virtue of the meritoriousness of the Offerer, rewardable. Life in association with, and in union with, Christ risen and glorified, is the reward. Therefore we read of the exceeding greatness of God's power "to usward who believe, according to the working of His mighty power, which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places." (Eph. i. 19.) Viewed in our risen Head our separation from the flesh is perfect; for we are cir-

* See this rendering of κατεκρινε in Wicliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer and Rheimish Version.

Digitized by Google

cumcised by the circumcision made without hands, by a circumcision received in virtue of our association with Christ in His death and resurrection, so that we are said to be "filled to the full (πεπληρωμενοι) in Him." There is no evolution or gradual progression here. As every plant set in Paradise was perfect in its kind when planted there, so every saint when brought into God's presence is perfected. This is what the second chapter of Colossians testifies: this is that which philosophic Christianity denies. "Beware," says the Apostle, "lest any spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." It is not too much to say that the statements of Mr. Drummond, and all like statements, run the plough-share over everything that Scripture teaches respecting Redemption and its results. The second chapter of Colossians perishes. Philosophic systems find no place for Redemption *as revealed in the Word of God.* That which He has revealed respecting Himself as God the Creator, and that which He has revealed respecting Himself as God the Redeemer, is alike set aside. Scripture is abandoned, and human speculation substituted.

§ IX.

IT is a sorrowful fact, too plainly proved by experience, that Truth, as sent into the world by God,

Digitized by Google

is, as regards its practical use by man, sure to be more or less perverted. Deterioration is the natural law of fallen humanity. It becomes, therefore, one of the chief duties of those who fear God to war against human corruptions, and to separate "the precious from the vile." "If thou take forth the precious from the vile, thou shalt be as My mouth."

Mr. Drummond seems acutely sensitive to the folly of the (so-called) syllogism, which, he says, the popular Protestantism of this country favours:

"You believe Christ died for sinners;

"You are a sinner;

"Therefore Christ died for you, and *hence you are saved*" (p. 331). Few, I think, will be disposed to defend such a statement as this. I say *statement*, for syllogism it is not. The well-known rule, "*nec quartus terminus adsit*," is altogether violated here. The sentiment embodied in this statement is not only silly; it is dangerous. Mr. Drummond ought not to have formulated such folly without at the same time declaring that it is a statement which Luther, Calvin, Knox, Bullinger, Davenant, Owen, Goodwin, Howe, Toplady, Whitfield, Newton, Cecil, and all like-minded men would reject with abhorrence. *Their* syllogism would have been on this wise:—

"Sinners who believe, are persons for whom Christ procured a sure and certain TITLE to salvation by the one oblation on the Cross.

"We are sinners who believe.

Digitized by Google

"Therefore we are persons for whom Christ provided a sure and certain TITLE to salvation by the oblation of Himself on the Cross."

They would at the same time have given a definition of "Justifying Faith." They would have said, it is "Fiducia, *i.e.*, Reliance (of course a *true* reliance) on the Divine mercy remitting sin for Christ's sake"—a definition which not only Rome, but philosophic Christianity also, spurns. Yet it is the key-stone of all true Christianity. This all the orthodox Protestant Confessions, whether Anglican, Scotch, or Foreign, teach. So teaches the Bible. But in what do Mr. Drummond's doctrines respecting salvation accord with the Bible?

In order to receive aright the doctrine of God touching Salvation we must understand *from* what it saveth. Accordingly, the Scripture removes the vail from the awful future, and declares in language too plain to be evaded, that we (being by nature "children of wrath," and persons on whom "the wrath of God abideth") must, by the natural law of our being, unless its operation be intercepted, be borne onward to meet the sentence long since pronounced upon fallen man—the sentence of "*judgment unto condemnation.*" (See Rom. v. 18.)

Nor is the character of that judgment concealed. "Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," are words which indicate, with a plainness too great to be evaded, the final issue. "The place prepared for the Devil

Digitized by Google

and his angels" is the place appointed to unpardoned man. That place is thus referred to in the Revelation: "And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the Beast and the false prophet are, and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." And again, "The cowardly (δειλοι), and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Rev. xxi. 8). And again, "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 15). There are other like awful warnings: and to them we have to add the words of the Lord Jesus as recorded in Mark ix. After speaking of Hell (Gehenna), and the fire not to be quenched (see verse 43, πυρ ασβεστον), He adds, "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into the Gehenna of fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (verse 47). Such are the warnings of God. Shall we despise them? Shall we imitate Eve, who believed the Devil rather than God? The Devil said, "Ye shall not surely die." Yet Eve *did* die. Let us beware, therefore, of listening to the voice of the Deceiver. Let us rather believe and tremble: for flesh and blood ought to tremble in the pre-

Digitized by Google

sence of declarations such as these: "My flesh trembleth because of Thee, and I am afraid of Thy judgments." "Horror hath taken hold upon me, because of the wicked that forsake thy law." (Ps. cxix. 120 and 53). From these things nature shrinks: but let us not be tempted either to bury the Truth, or to sit in judgment upon God, and "to reply against Him." It would be useless as well as wicked, for we cannot withstand God. It is very certain that God, in speaking of the "torment" of the wicked, would not have used the expression "for ever and ever"—the very words that He has employed to declare His own everlasting existence—if that torment were not "everlasting": nor would the Lord have used the words, "where THEIR worm dieth not, and where the fire is not quenched." The word THEIR implies the everlasting existence of the persons to whom a never-dying worm is thus appropriated; and the fire would not be described as fire "*not to be quenched*," if no end were to be answered by its remaining unquenched. The words, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever," are words that cannot be evaded.

Shall we then say with Mr. Drummond and his system, that the salvation prepared in Christ is not salvation from "Gehenna," or from the lake of fire, or from "the resurrection of damnation"—for that there is no Gehenna, no lake of fire, no everlasting torment? Shall we say that salvation

Digitized by Google

is not deliverance from *torment*, but deliverance from *extinction*, that the doom of the wicked is cessation of existence, even as blasted or blighted trees die out and cease to be? Is "the terror of the Lord" thus to be removed from the consciences of men? Would the joy of the redeemed be what it is to be in glory, if there were no wrath, no pit from which they will know themselves to have been delivered? Would the sufferings of the Lord Jesus have been what they were—would He have said what He did say in Psalm xxii. (see verses 14 and 15)—if He had not been the wrath-bearer? "It pleased Jehovah to bruise Him, and to put Him to grief."

I have seldom read anything more painful than the following passage:—

"The fundamental idea alike of the extreme Roman Catholic and extreme Evangelical Religions is Escape. Man's chief end is to 'get off.' And all factors in religion, the highest and most sacred, are degraded to this level. God, for example, is a Great Lawyer. Or He is the Almighty Enemy; it is from Him we have to 'get off.' Jesus Christ is the One who gets us off—a theological figure, who contrives so to adjust matters federally that the way is clear. The Church in the one instance is a kind of conveyancing office, where the transaction is duly concluded, each party accepting the other's terms; in the other case, a species of sheep-pen, where the flock awaits impatiently and indolently the final consummation." (P. 334.)

Luther and Owen are the chief writers who have enforced "FORENSIC" interpretation. Do they

Digitized by Google

deserve to be thus caricatured? They did but follow the Apostle Paul.

Because "WRATH is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men," we may, if we please, speak of God as "the Almighty Enemy"; or, because He has fixed laws, and governs according to those laws, we may sneer at Him as "a Great Lawyer." But they who know the plague of their own hearts are otherwise minded. They know that God, as "a Great King," must have Courts of government; and they thank Him, and will thank Him for ever and ever, for having made known the ordinances of those Courts. They are both mandatory and prohibitory. The first great *mandatory* commandment is, Thou shalt love and serve Me perfectly, and always. The great *prohibitory* commandment is, Thou shalt not desire evil (*ουκ επιθυμησεις*). Evil tendency is sin. These two commandments shut the door of hope for ever against fallen man as regards salvation by personal obedience. But another truth is made known. His Courts admit the principle of salvation by the Substitutional Service of Another. Before the earth was, by the concurrent love and wisdom of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, "a Surety" or "Sponsor" (*Εγγυος*) was appointed, who, for all who should seek the shelter of His name, undertook to do what *they* could not do—glorify God by keeping, on their behalf, His Law perfectly, and by bearing the appointed penalties. Thus

Digitized by Google

they who, *in the title of their own names*, are "children of wrath," become *in the title of their Surety's name*, heirs of glory. Their demerits are cancelled, and succeeded by the imputation of the merits of the Holy One. The appointment of the Surety, His judicial death, His Advocacy and Intercession, were all acts or services undertaken and executed in strict conformity with the Laws of God's Courts: but shall we say that because God appoints His own Laws and conforms His requirements and action to such Laws, that He is to be regarded as "a Great Lawyer"? The redeemed will bless Him for ever and ever for having been such a "Lawyer." They will thank Him too throughout eternity for having devised the means whereby, whilst proving Himself to be "the Great Enemy" of sin, He has proved Himself also to be the Lover of their souls. Joy at being "got off" from judgment (if I must use Mr. Drummond's expression) does not necessarily involve the exclusion of holy joy in being brought into favour, grace, and love. Nor in recognising Jesus Christ as the One who "gets us off," do we regard Him "*as a theological figure, who contrives so to adjust matters federally that the way is clear.*" Nor is "the Household of faith" into which, on believing, we are brought, regarded by us, or by God, as "a kind of conveyancing office, where the transaction is duly recorded:" nor is the fold of the One Shepherd looked on as "a species of sheep-pen,

Digitized by Google

where the flock awaits impatiently and indolently the final consummation." It is true that the sheep are scattered now and wandering—feeding often on fouled pastures; yet the Shepherd's eye is still on them, and He is still able to cause the flock "to rest at noon," and to know a peace which the "stranger intermeddleth not with." It is not to be denied that the flock of Christ as a whole has wandered and is weak, having listened in many things to the voice of the Deceiver. They have planted vineyards where they ought not; and have drunk of forbidden cups, and may become like Noah in his drunkenness. Yet we must beware of caricaturing their follies, or exposing their nakedness, lest the curse of Ham fall upon us.

There may be also a pretended faith. A man may "*say*" that he hath faith, and have it not. Such faith cannot save. He who as respects *his claim to salvation* is justified by faith alone, must as to *his claim to the possession of faith* be justified by some work or works that prove that his faith is real. Though Simon Magus had a dead faith which brought forth no fruit, Lydia and the jailer at Philippi, and the Eunuch in the wilderness, had faith that did bring forth fruit. The mere acknowledgment that certain things stated in the Scripture are true, is not faith. Satan knows everything that is written in the Scripture respecting evil and respecting good; respecting himself and respecting God; and many of his servants have

Digitized by Google

great knowledge. But they have no reliance on God as justifying freely, and remitting sin for Christ's sake. There is no fear, no contrition, no humiliation, no confession. They come not to the feet of Jesus to wash them with tears, and wipe them with the hair of their head. But wherever there is reliance on the work of the Lamb of God, *there* (seeing that such reliance is the result of the quickening power of God's Spirit creating in us the New Man which is like Himself, holy) there will be resulting developments. The magnetised needle turns necessarily to the pole. So the creation of the New Man in us leads to the service of good as certainly as the depraved nature received from Adam tends to the service of evil. God in the New Covenant of grace does not only say, "Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more": He also saith, "I will write my laws upon their heart, that they shall not depart from Me:" and one of the chief indications of His law being so written is subjection of soul to the doctrines of Holy Scripture, and ability to detect the voice of the Deceiver. Where it is otherwise, and the soul replies against God, there is reason to fear that our faith is like that of Simon Magus—dead faith, being alone. Child-like subjection to the Word of God is one of the great evidences of a sanctified heart. "He that advanceth (or leadeth forward, *ὁ προαγων*), and abideth not IN THE DOCTRINE of Christ, hath not God." (2 John 9.)

Digitized by Google

§ X.

ANOTHER indication of being brought under the control of the Spirit of God (without which there can be no practical sanctification) is an ability and disposition to mark the operations of the hand of God amongst men, and to estimate rightly their character. Not to recognise them is a sin: to recognise and to misjudge them is rebellion.

Since the Apostles died there has been no intervention of the hand of God so great as the Protestant Reformation. The true doctrine of salvation was lost: men's souls were perishing, when Luther's tortured soul grasped, through God's mercy, the true FORENSIC meaning of Justification, and learned (to use the words of our English Confession) that "We are accounted righteous before God ONLY because of [*propter*] the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ through [*per*] faith, and not for our own works and deservings." And again: "There is none other thing that can be named under Heaven, to save our souls, but this only work of Christ's precious offering of His body upon the altar of the Cross. Certainly, there can be no work of any mortal man, be he never so holy, that shall be coupled in merits with Christ's most holy act." (Homily xxv.)

The Reformation was not perfected. It was

Digitized by Google

hindered and marred in its results through human evil. But shall we say that the disinterment of this great Truth respecting the Justification of a sinner was not the work of God? Shall we attribute it to the Enemy? It is very evident that any who complain that popular Protestantism represents God as "a Great Lawyer," and that it "makes Jesus Christ a theological figure, who contrives so to adjust matters federally that the way is clear"—it is manifest that any who thus write or think, can have little sympathy with the work of Luther and his fellow-labourers. The great truth that made the soul of Luther rejoice with joy unspeakable, was, that God "justifieth" (through faith in the vicarious sacrificial service of His Son) "THE UNGODLY" (Rom. iv. 5). That thought Mr. Drummond's system necessarily repudiates. According to his system, Humanity, through a series of evolutionary developments, may attain such a degree of congruity with heavenly condition as to fit it for the action of "Christ-life," whereby it is further operated on, and advances. The words, "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus," can have no place in such a system as this. The first proof of attained Regeneration according to Mr. Drummond is, not faith in the One Oblation, but our "first victory over sin." He says, "Whatever the conscious hour of the second birth may be—in the

Digitized by Google

case of an adult it is probably defined by the first real victory over sin" (p. 184). Thus, according to Mr. Drummond, practical victory over sin is the first evidence of attained Life. Is this what the Lord Jesus teaches in the third chapter of John? He is there speaking of Regeneration and *Eternal** Life, and answers the question of Nicodemus respecting their attainment. How does He answer it? By speaking of the Serpent of Brass presented as an object of faith to the perishing. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." Certainly there was in the bitten perishing Israelite no congruity or affinity with health, or with life. They were smitten because of their transgression, yet whilst they were still in the distance they heard the proclamation of mercy, and as many as looked at the appointed object of faith were healed. It was an object external to themselves. God appointed it, and told them that their title to look was to be found in the fact that they were perishing. Are we better than they? No: in no wise. We are all under sin. "He who offendeth in one point is guilty of all." As sinners needing salvation

---

* The Life, supposed by Mr. Drummond to be attained, appears, by his subsequent statements, to be one of uncertain tenure.

Digitized by Google

we all stand on the same level. As the thief on the Cross entered the Kingdom, so do we. We do not come to the sheep-fold as victors who claim to be numbered among the regenerate because we have obtained "our first victory over sin." We do not come as those whom the Law of Natural evolution has raised into a congruity with Life. We come to Him as the Living One indeed, but as the Living One who "became dead." (See Rev. i. 8, *Εγενομην νεκρος*). We come to Him as "the Lamb *slain*." In that atoning death under wrath we find that which correspondeth with our environment—for our environment is guilt: but in "the Lamb slain" we find that which cancelleth the guilt. "He hath freed us [*ελυσεν ἡμας*] from our sins by His own blood." *So* we find the grace whereby God justifieth the ungodly. Are these questions a strife about words, or are they vital, affecting eternity?

Christ is not to be preached merely as the Living One. He is to be preached as the Living One *dying a judicial, sacrificial, substitutional death for others:* but this is that which Philosophy in every age has accounted "foolishness." "We preach Christ CRUCIFIED, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." "By the foolishness of preaching" God "SAVETH them that believe." The Cross of Christ therefore, (or to

Digitized by Google

speak typically, Christ as the Brazen Serpent), is the object to be presented to them whose regeneration we desire. If our weak words become (under God's blessing) the means of causing any to look believingly at Him, as the dying Israelites looked at the Serpent of Brass, they receive (according to our Lord's own words) "*eternal* life;" and therefore are numbered among the regenerate. Nicodemus asked, "How can these things be?" "How can a man be born again?" How did the Lord reply? He replied, *by speaking of the Brazen Serpent.* No answer could be more pertinent—none more conclusive. He who looks at Him crucified, as the Israelite looked at the Serpent of brass, becomes a possessor of eternal life—in other words, becomes regenerate. Now compare with these methods of Divine grace the following words of Mr. Drummond:—

"O preposterous and vain man, thou who couldest not make a finger-nail of thy body, thinkest thou to fashion this wonderful, mysterious, subtle soul of thine after the ineffable Image? Wilt thou ever permit thyself *to be* conformed to the Image of the Son? Wilt thou, who canst not add a cubit to thy stature, submit *to be* raised by the Type-Life within thee to the perfect stature of Christ?" (P. 308.)

This "Type-life" of which Mr. Drummond speaks, he afterwards terms "Christ-Life," saying, "Bird-Life" makes the bird, "Christ-Life" makes the "Christian." This "Christ-Life" he supposes to be "*within*" the persons of whom he speaks: which

Digitized by Google

(if it were true) would mark those in whom this life is, as already regenerate and brought for ever out of the kingdom of darkness into the Kingdom of God. But Mr. Drummond's system refuses to recognise this. He thinks that those "*within*" whom the Christ-life is, are not thereby marked as regenerate: on the contrary, they may resist its workings and perish. They only who "*submit to be raised by it*," and who "permit" themselves "to be conformed to the Image of the Son" attain salvation. Our permission and submission are the first links in the chain of blessing, and it pertains to us to supply those links. Moreover, that which is made the ground of salvation is conformity to the Image of Christ, not the imputation of His merits. This, indeed, is "a different gospel, which is not another." It is a gospel which the Scripture knows not.

Mr. Drummond further says :—

"A comprehensive view of the whole field of Nature discloses the fact that the circle of the chosen slowly contracts as we rise in the scale of being. Some mineral, but not all, becomes vegetable; some vegetable, but not all, becomes animal; some animal, but not all, becomes human; some human, but not all, becomes Divine. Thus the area narrows. At the base is the mineral, most broad and simple; the spiritual at the apex, smallest, but most highly differentiated. So form rises above form, Kingdom above Kingdom. *Quantity decreases as quality increases.*

"The gravitation of the whole system of Nature towards quality is surely a phenomenon of commanding interest.

Digitized by Google

And if, among the more recent revelations of Nature, there is one thing more significant for Religion than another, it is the majestic spectacle of the rise of Kingdoms towards scarcer yet nobler forms, and simpler yet diviner ends. Of the early stage, the first development of the earth from the nebulous matrix of space, Science speaks with reserve. The second, the evolution of each individual from the simple protoplasmic cell to the formed adult, is proved. The still wider evolution, not of solitary individuals, but of all the individuals within each province—in the vegetal world from the unicellular cryptogam to the highest phanerogam, in the animal world from the amorphous amœba to Man—is at least suspected, the gradual rise of types being at all events a fact. But now, at last, we see the Kingdoms themselves evolving. And that supreme law which has guided the development from simple to complex in matter, in individual, in sub-Kingdom and in Kingdom, until only two or three great Kingdoms remain, now begins at the beginning again, directing the evolution of these million-peopled worlds, as if they were simple cells or organisms." (P. 411.)

Now, I must be pardoned for saying, that all this is nonsense. There is no more reality in these speculations than in the soap-bubbles that children float into the air. But no absurdities are too great for intellectual gladiators to amuse themselves with. Of this, however, we may be very sure, that since the world was, no mineral ever became a vegetable, or an animal, or a man. The various sections of creation, whether animal, vegetable, or mineral, remain in their distinctness, just as on the day when God created them according to their kinds; and so they will remain until He that

Digitized by Google

sitteth on the Throne shall say, "Behold, I make all things new." But even if this fancied Evolution had been the law of the natural world, it could not have reached on into the Spiritual, for as regards fallen humanity, a barrier separates the Natural and Spiritual World, that separates not the mineral and vegetable worlds, or any other of the irresponsible departments of nature. No human being can be raised into the Spiritual World that cannot show a valid title to exemption from wrath. Every one who enters the Spiritual World in peace must stand under the shelter of a Surety's merits. If there were such a thing in the arrangements of Nature as Evolutionary progression from one sphere of being to another, it would be carried on without any question of wrath or of merit. Irresponsible creatures can have nothing to do with either. But man is born unto "wrath," and therefore none can enter the Spiritual World to share its blessings, unless they have first been brought under the shelter of the Blood of the Lamb, and obtained on the ground of His merits a title to Life. "If any man be in Christ, *to him* there is a new creation. Old things have passed away, behold, all things have become new." This is a sphere into which no Natural Law, much less *evolutionary* Law enters. The Old-Adamic gives place to the New-Adamic.

Mr. Drummond further says:—

Digitized by Google

"Thus what applies to the individual applies to the family, what applies to the family applies to the Kingdom, what applies to the Kingdom applies to the Kingdoms. And so, out of the infinite complexity there rises an infinite simplicity, the foreshadowing of a final unity, of that

> 'One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves.'

This is the final triumph of continuity, the heart-secret of Creation, the unspoken prophecy of Christianity. To Science, defining it as a working principle, this mighty process of amelioration is simply *Evolution*. To Christianity, discerning the end through the means, it is *Redemption*." (P. 413.)

It is not easy to extract intelligible meaning from rhapsody. These words, however, (and other like words scattered throughout the volume,) seem to indicate that there is evolutionary progression among the redeemed in glory; so that *there* also, Kingdom will give place to Kingdom in illimitable progression, and Redemption would bring neither rest nor perfectness, nor even *certainty;* for what if through neglect there should be want of correspondency with the higher environments when proposed? Those who should fall short in the required correspondency, must (even after they have entered the Spiritual World), according to the Natural Law of Evolution, perish, that is (taking Mr. Drummond's sense of "perish") cease to be. Want of conformity to type is supposed to be the general rule in the Natural World, and so, reasoning by analogy, we may suppose it would be the general rule in the Spiritual

Digitized by Google

World; so that few would hold on till the evolutionary trial was over, and therefore few escape extinction. This, I say, would be the reasonable conclusion if the monstrous premises were admitted. If any should hold on until the end, they, apparently, would be absorbed into God. Buddhism may sympathise with this, but it is not the Gospel of the grace of God.

Redemption brings to secure and stable blessings. Redemption *by payment of price* is already perfect. Nothing can be added to it—nothing taken away from it. But Redemption by *power*—that which is called in Scripture "the redemption of appropriation*—when God will appropriate unto Himself that which He hath purchased by the death of His Son—*that* Redemption is yet to come. When it cometh, all who are the subjects of it—all who have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb"—will rise in glory, *perfected*, bearing the image of the *Heavenly*, even as they have here borne the image of the *earthly* Adam. They are already "filled to the full" (πεπληρωμενοι) in Christ: their life is already "hid with Christ in God"; but then, that fulness and that life shall be manifested. Individually they shall be like Him, and see Him as He is: corporately they shall be His mystical body, "the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." "The

* Απολυτρωσις της περιποιησεως (Eph. i. 14).

Digitized by Google

glory which thou gavest Me I have given them: that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one: and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me" (John xvii. 22, 23.) This is glory and love "passing knowledge": but it certainly excludes the thought of evolution and evolutionary uncertainty. It shows that as in the natural creation every tree and every plant was, without evolution and without growth, placed in full possession of its proper perfectness in Eden, so also in the Paradise of God, on the morning of the Resurrection, each one of the redeemed shall enter into the mansions prepared for them, *perfected:* for they shall be "conformed to the image" of their Lord—"satisfied" when they awake up "in His likeness."

Digitized by Google

§ XI.

EXTRACTS AND NOTES.

I. "*We have Truth in Nature as it came from God.*" (Preface, p. xi.)

In the Paradisiacal Earth it was so. All there was "very good." There was no wasting, no destruction, no sin, no disease, no sorrow. The lion and the tiger, like all other beasts, fed on the herb of the field (see Genesis i. 30). But "sin entered," and all was changed. We are now living in a smitten earth—an earth stricken with the stroke of judgment. Creation has been "subjected to the bondage of corruption" and "groaneth" everywhere, and always. Is this the sphere in which we are to learn "Truth in Nature as it came from God?" Are we to ignore or cancel the commencing chapters of Genesis and all that they teach respecting THE FALL?

II. "*In the first place it* [Science] *offers to corroborate Theology, in the second to purify it.*" (Preface, p. xviii.)

Our Theology is found in the Bible. Does the Bible teach us to look to Science for the *purification* of its statements? "The words of Jehovah

Digitized by Google

are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." (Ps. xii. 6.) They need no human purifying.

III. "*Nature may yet have to define the contents as well as the limits of belief.*" (Preface, p. xix.)

In other words, I must read the Bible under the control and tuition of Science.

Mr. Drummond does not deny that the Bible is infallible, nor does the Church of Rome. Both admit that the voice of the Bible is authoritative, but not *alone* authoritative. Other voices also are to be heard.

Wherever this is asserted it will be found practically, that the *determinative* authority will be sought, not in the Bible, but in that which they have dared to associate with it.

In conversing once with a clergyman who had joined the Church of Rome, I asked him whether, if I proved to him that a certain statement was to be found in the Bible, he would receive it on the ground of its being there written? He answered, Yes. I repeated the question. Would you receive it simply and only on the ground of its being found in the Scripture? He replied: Yes; if Holy Mother Church sanctioned the interpretation. An interpretation that jarred with that of the Church he would not receive. I feel justified in saying, that Mr. Drummond would not

Digitized by Google

receive any statement of Scripture that was not, in his judgment, sustained by the voice of Science. Subsequent quotations will show the reasons I have for saying this.

IV. "*To those who are feeling their way to a Christian life, haunted now by a sense of instability in the foundations of their faith, now brought to bay by specific doubt at one point raising, as all doubt does, the question for the whole, I would hold up a light which has often been kind to me. There is a sense of solidity about a Law of Nature which belongs to nothing else in the world. Here, at last, amid all that is shifting, is one thing sure; one thing outside ourselves, unbiassed, unprejudiced, uninfluenced by like or dislike, by doubt or fear; one thing that holds on its way to me eternally, incorruptible, and undefiled. This, more than anything else, makes one eager to see the Reign of Law traced in the Spiritual Sphere.*" (Preface, p. xxiii.)

This quotation fully justifies the assertion I have above made. Mr. Drummond says that "there is a solidity about a Law of Nature *which belongs to nothing else in the world.*" In other words, there is something in the world more solid and more to be depended on than the Bible. "Natural Law," he says, "is the ONE thing that holds on its way to me eternally, incorruptible, and undefiled." If this be so, if Natural Law be superior in these respects to the Bible, the voice of Natural Law

Digitized by Google

must of course be determinative whenever its voice jars with that of Scripture.

V. "*I confess that even when, in the first dim vision, the organising hand of Law moved among the unordered truths of my Spiritual World, poor and scantily-furnished as it was, there seemed to come over it the beauty of a transfiguration. The change was as great as from the old chaotic world of Pythagoras to the symmetrical and harmonious universe of Newton. My Spiritual World before was a chaos of facts: my Theology, a Pythagorean system trying to make the best of Phenomena apart from the idea of Law. I make no charge against Theology in general. I speak of my own. And I say that I saw it to be in many essential respects centuries behind every department of Science I knew. It was the one region still unpossessed by Law.*" (Preface, pp. ix. and x.)

In other words, the light of the Bible having been found by Mr. Drummond insufficient and unsatisfying, he seeks other guidance. The effect of this exchange, he says, "was an entire re-casting of Truth." "It was not simply a scientific colouring given to Religion, the mere freshening of the theological air with natural facts and illustrations. It was an entire re-casting of Truth." (Preface, p. viii.)

VI. "*None but those who have passed through it can appreciate the radical nature of the change*

Digitized by Google

brought by Science in the whole mental attitude of its disciples. What they really cry out for in religion is a new stand-point—a stand-point of their own." (Preface, p. xxi.)

That new stand-point they may attain, but the price at which it is purchased will be the abandonment of God. There is such a thing as judicial blindness. God can send "strong delusion," and the hour when He will send it is drawing nigh. For "the Household of faith," *their* stand-point will be preserved. Their stand-point is determined simply and only by the Scripture. Thence they see all things with the eye *of faith* which rests wholly on the authority of God's Word. Science has another stand-point, and another eye. They who have the eye of Nature, emphatically walk *by sight;* and that sight is directed and controlled, not by the One true God, but by "the god of this age," who can deceive by silvery words, and assume the garb of an angel of light. (See Rom. xvi. 18.)

Mr. Drummond says, "The old ground of faith, AUTHORITY, is given up." (P. 26.) If the ground of "*authority*" be given up, God and the Scripture must also be given up.

VII. "*Men must oppose with every energy they possess what SEEMS TO THEM to oppose the eternal course of things.*" (Preface, p. xxi.)

Digitized by Google

To what must this principle lead? If that which God hath said be true—that "His ways are not as our ways, nor His thoughts as our thoughts," our thoughts must be contrary to His. Consequently, if we persist in adhering to our own thoughts, we must be in perpetual conflict with God.

VIII. "*The position we have been led to take up is not that the Spiritual Laws are analogous to the Natural Laws, but that they are the same Laws.*" (P. 11.)

In that case there can be no essential difference between the First Adam, who is of the earth, earthy; and the Second Man, who is from Heaven; and the words, "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," would utterly lose their power. Paul and John when caught up for a season into Heaven, did not think that the laws of the sphere they had left were *the same* as the laws of the new sphere they had entered. Paul did not know whether he was "in the body, or out of the body," and the words he heard it was not lawful for man to utter: and John fell down as one dead. "Flesh and blood" can have no place in the Kingdom of Glory, neither can "corruption inherit incorruption."

IX. "*As the vision of Newton rested on a clearer and richer world than that of Plato, so, though*

Digitized by Google

seeing the same things in the Spiritual World as our fathers, we may see them clearer and richer. With the work of the centuries upon it, the mental eye is a finer instrument, and demands a more ordered world." (P. 33.)

The reverse is the fact. Knowledge of natural things may have increased, but knowledge of spiritual things has decreased. The rule in Israel's history was declension; the rule in Christendom's history has been, and is, declension. As soon as the Apostles died, retrogression commenced: and in the last days "perilous times" are to come. The eye of Christendom, vitiated by centuries of declension and apostasy, has become darkened. "Seeing, they see not." A film has come over the eye even of true believers, and they need eye-salve. (See the words of the Lord Jesus in Rev. iii.)

X. "*Wherever there is life we may expect to find it arranged, ordered, governed according to the same Law.*" (Pp. 45, 46.)

That is to say, the Life (ζωη) and the condition of Life (βιος) that pertains to Him who is the Head of the New Creation of God (One in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily) is arranged, ordered and governed by the same Laws that regulate the Life (ζωη) and condition of Life (βιος) that attaches to the earthy

Digitized by Google

Adam. They who can accept such a statement as that, may be expected to acquiesce in anything. This monstrous notion of similarity between two utterly contrasted conditions is a fallacy —a ψευδος in itself sufficient to vitiate the whole book.

It is true that Mr. Drummond is not altogether unconscious that his conclusion is not quite secure. Therefore he says, and unsays: but although not unwilling to make some concessions, the exigencies of his system prevent him from recognising that determined line of separation which the Scripture draws between the flesh and the Spirit.

On page 47, he says:—

"*Two questions now remain for further consideration—one bearing on the possibility of new Law in the spiritual; the other, on the assumed invisibility or inconspicuousness of the old Laws, on account of their subordination to the new.*" (P. 47.)

Here Mr. Drummond condescends to consider "*the possibility*" of new Law in the Spiritual World. In other words, we are asked to enquire whether that which is a *necessary* and actually existent fact be *possible.* This is rather a strange subject of inquiry. Nor should we be satisfied with the admission that there may be the operation of old and new Laws together—the new predominating over, and hiding the old. We maintain unequivocally that the Spiritual World is not "arranged, ordered and governed" by the *same* laws that

Digitized by Google

arrange order and govern the Natural World. When the Natural World shall have passed away, its distinctive laws pass away.

XI. "*It might next be urged that such a Law as Biogenesis, which, as we hope to show afterwards, is the fundamental Law of life for both the Natural and Spiritual Worlds, can have no application whatsoever in the latter sphere. . . . The vital principle of the body is a different thing from the vital principle of the Spiritual life. Biogenesis deals with βιος, with the natural life, with cells and germs, and as there are no exactly similar cells and germs in the Spiritual World, the Law cannot therefore apply. All which is as true as if one were to say that the fifth proposition of the First Book of Euclid applies when the figures are drawn with chalk upon a blackboard, but fails with regard to structures of wood or stone.*" (P. 45.)

Few, I should think, would be *misled* by this illustration. The question in dispute is tacitly assumed—assumed without proof. No one disputes that the laws presented abstractedly in the sketch on the blackboard are the same laws as are brought into practical use in the building. In the one case they are *stated;* in the other *applied.* But they are *confessedly* the same laws. In the present case our dispute is about the laws themselves. We say that the laws of the Spiritual World (no matter whether they be abstractedly stated, or

Digitized by Google

practically applied) are *not* the same laws that regulate the Natural World.

XII. "*The greatest among the Theological Laws are the Laws of Nature in disguise.*" (P. 52.)

Salvation by the vicarious death and vicarious righteousness of a Divine Substitute is the pillar of Bible-Theology. What Law of Nature, whether in disguise, or out of disguise, teaches this? The very best of the teaching of Philosophic Christianity would lead us to enter into the presence of God like Nadab and Abihu did, with fire that had not fed on *sacrifice.* They ventured into the presence of unpropitiated holiness: and they perished.

An altar, a sacrifice, and an atoning Priest must stand between us and God, or we perish. An altar and a sacrifice and an atoning Priest, Nature and Natural Law cannot supply.

XIII. "*The first in the field was the Spiritual World. It is not necessary to reproduce here in detail the argument which has been stated recently with so much force in the 'Unseen Universe.' The conclusion of that work remains still unassailed, that the visible universe has been developed from the unseen. Apart from the general proof from the Law of Continuity, the more special grounds of such a conclusion are, first, the fact insisted upon by Herschel and Clerk-Maxwell, that the atoms of which*

Digitized by Google

the visible universe is built up, bear distinct marks of being manufactured articles; and, secondly, the origin in time of the visible universe is implied from known facts with regard to the dissipation of energy. With the gradual aggregation of mass, the energy of the universe has been slowly disappearing, and this loss of energy must go on until none remains. There is, therefore, a point in time when the energy of the universe must come to an end; and that which has its end in time cannot be infinite, it must also have had a beginning in time. Hence the unseen existed before the seen." (Page 53.)

There is a misleading ambiguity in many of Mr. Drummond's expressions.

He says, "the unseen existed before the seen." This, no doubt, is true if by "unseen world" is meant that heavenly sphere in which God existed from everlasting, and where angels were created before this material universe was called into being. But, in our present discussion we are not speaking of that circle of self-existent being which pertains to the three Divine Persons as God: or of that circle of being which pertains to the holy angels: we are speaking of the human sphere. In that sphere there are two different developments of humanity—one, that we now see around us, bearing the form and fashion of the First Adam: another, that we are to see when the glory of the Second Man, the Last Adam, is

Digitized by Google

manifested. In the human sphere the Spiritual does not, as Mr. Drummond teaches, precede the Natural, but the Natural precedes the Spiritual. "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards, that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." (1 Cor. xv. 46.) These words authoritatively decide the question, and quench all thought of Platonic Archetypes.

Mr. Drummond says that "The atoms of which the visible universe is built up, bear distinct marks of being manufactured articles." That, as I have already said, is sufficiently disproved by one text which tells us "that things which are seen (*τα βλεπομενα*) were not made of things which do appear" (*εκ των φαινομενων*). No further proof will be required by those who believe the Scripture. Others I am not addressing.

And as regards the gradual wasting or "dissipation" of everything of which he speaks, we shall feel little disposition to listen to anything that can be said on that head, when we remember that the Universe and all that is in it, ever has been, and still is, upheld by the word of the power of the Eternal Son. He "upholdeth all things by the Word of His power." His is a strength that cannot wane. There can be no "dissipation" thereof. He may withdraw it, but it doth not decay.

Digitized by Google

XIV. "*Salvation is a definite process. If a man refuse to submit himself to that process, clearly he cannot have the benefits of it. As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the sons of God. He does not avail himself of this power. It may be mere carelessness or apathy. Nevertheless the neglect is fatal. He cannot escape because he will not.*" (Page 109.)

The Lord Jesus said, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, HATH everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment; (εις κρισιν) but HATH passed (μεταβεβηκεν) from death unto life." (John v.) These words describe no "*process.*" We cannot speak of such bestowment as "*a process submitted to.*" Salvation in its first great sense is not "a process." It is the free bestowal of a sure TITLE to immunity from wrath, and to inheritance of glory, solely on the ground of a process gone through and completed by Another who finished the work which the Father gave Him to do.

Hence the salvation of believers is again and again spoken of in the Scripture as a work finished.

"By grace ye have been saved" (εστε σεσωσμενοι). (Eph. ii. 5.)

"By grace ye have been saved (εστε σεσωσμενοι) through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." (Eph. ii. 8.)

Digitized by Google

"Who saved us (σωσας ἡμας), and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace that was given us in Christ Jesus before the world was." (2 Tim. i. 3.)

"Whom He justified, them He also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.)

Like passages abound. Indeed, how could it be otherwise? If *Title* to salvation rests entirely on the "one oblation" (and it does), that one oblation is a completed act. "Sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once."

But there is another use of the words "save" and "salvation." They are sometimes used in a future sense, referring to that period of final deliverance when *the salvation of promise* shall give place to *the salvation of accomplishment.* Accordingly, we read of "the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." (1 Peter i. 5.) Again, our salvation is said to be a salvation "of hope," or of expectancy. "We are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope, for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." But this fulfilled salvation cannot, any more than the former, be described as "a process" to be submitted to. It will be a sudden act of Christ's glorious power, founded on the title acquired by His redeeming blood, causing mortality to be swallowed up of life, and giving

Digitized by Google

to all those brought by faith under the value of His atoning blood, *practical* meetness for heaven.

But there is yet another sense in which these words are used. The sure *Title* to Salvation is given the moment we cast ourselves by faith on the atoning death of the One Shepherd. Then we enter that fold, the sheep whereof never perish. But the period between the moment of our entrance and the time of accomplished salvation *is* one of difficulty and danger. We find ourselves in a world of which Satan is the Ruler (*αρχων*, see John xiv. 30), and his rage is peculiarly directed against the sheep of the true Shepherd. Snares, trials, and perils surround us, through which One only can preserve. The difficulties are too great for any hand, save that of God, to cope *with*. "If the righteous with difficulty (*μολις*) be saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?" Accordingly, we read that they who have "an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, reserved in heaven for them" (no words can be more expressive of certainty than these) are kept or guarded (*φρουρουμενοι*) by the power of God through faith unto salvation, *ready to be revealed in the last time.* (See 1 Pet. i. 4, 5). And again, in Jude, "the called" are described as beloved by God the Father and preserved by Jesus Christ.* Thus, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant (the New

* Τοις εν θεῳ πατρι ηγαπημενοις και Ιησου Χριστῳ τετηρημενοις.

Digitized by Google

Covenant of Grace, see Heb. viii.) a Shepherd, Priest, Advocate and Intercessor is provided, in whose grace, love, power and faithfulness we trust. "Faithful is He that called you into the fellowship of His Son." Over all, therefore, who belong to Christ through faith in His blood, there is extended "a process" of faithful care, which by the Household of faith is (through the same grace that caused them to believe) recognised and welcomed. But they have no confidence in their own powers of preservation, or in their own ability to attain or maintain right correspondency with their own environments, either in time, or in eternity. A salvation based on the attainment of such a correspondency would be a salvation not by grace but by works.

Mr. Drummond fails to recognise the line which Scripture has drawn between the Household of faith and all others. Consequently, his interpretations of Scripture are inaccurate and misleading. An example of this is found in his interpretation of John i. 12. In the context the Lord Jesus is spoken of as having come as the Light into the midst of Israel and of the world, and being by both rejected. "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him, to them gave He title [or "right," see Heb. xiii. 10—the word is *εξουσια*, not *δυναμις*] to become the

Digitized by Google

sons of God, even to them that believed on His name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This verse speaks not of power given in order that by the due use thereof Sonship and Regeneration might be attained: it speaks of Sonship and Regeneration surely and in perpetuity bestowed. They who received Him became, *as soon as they received Him*, sons of God. This verse is one of the great pillars of our faith. But Mr. Drummond subverts it. Like all Ecclesiastic and Philosophic systems, he makes salvation to be not of grace, but of works. He makes it depend *not* on the finished service and oblation of the Holy One, but on the right use of certain gifts and privileges which that service has obtained: so that Life, even after it has been bestowed, may be lost by the negligence of the recipient in maintaining the right correspondencies. According to this doctrine, the Cross may perhaps bring "*salvability*," but it cannot bring "salvation" to any.* The Scripture,

* The doctrine of Mr. Drummond as to this is virtually the same as that of Rome, of which Hooker says: Whether they [the Romanists] speak of the first or second justification, they make the essence of it to be *a divine quality inherent;* they make it righteousness *which is in us.* If it be in us then it is ours, as our souls are ours, though we have them from God, and can hold them no longer than pleaseth Him; for if He withdraw the breath of our nostrils,

Digitized by Google

however, teaches otherwise. It tells us that we are justified by "Christ's blood; and that whom God justified, them He also glorified."

Again, he refers to Heb. ii. 3: "How shall we escape if we neglect," or rather, "after having neglected [ἀμελήσαντες] so great salvation?" No true believer comes within this class. The fact that they have believed, proves that they have not neglected. Unbelievers and nominal believers will at the last day be sentenced as those "who have neglected": but to no true believer, however feeble, can these words, or any like words, be applied. "He that believeth shall never be confounded."

I admit that true believers may decline, and build stubble instead of gold on the one foundation, and may be chastened grievously, and be saved like persons drawn through the fires of their burning habitation. This is a solemn question, but it is a different one. Many of the Corinthian, Galatian, and Hebrew believers had declined, and were admonished; but they were not lost.

In addressing corporate bodies the Apostles often used words implying doubt; for they knew that

---

we fall to dust. But the righteousness wherein we must be found, if we will be justified, is not our own. *Therefore we cannot be justified by any inherent quality.* The Church of Rome by teaching Justification by inherent Grace, *doth pervert the Truth of Christ:* and by the hands of the Apostles we have received otherwise than she teacheth." (Hooker's Discourse on Justification, §§ 5, 6.)

Digitized by Google

in corporate bodies tares will be found mingled with wheat: but no instance can be found where words of doubt are used by the Apostles of any individuals whom they personally knew and recognised as being in the faith. They said confidently of such, "whose names are in the book of life."

The indistinctness with which Mr. Drummond draws his line between the Household of faith and the world, renders it often very difficult to determine of which he is speaking; and even when he appears to draw the line, his expressions too plainly show that he has no adequate apprehension of the magnitude of the differences that separate the two classes that are divided by it.

XV. "*Turn now to another aspect of the case—to the effect upon the soul itself. Neglect does more for the soul than make it miss salvation. It despoils it of its capacity for salvation. Degeneration in the spiritual sphere involves primarily the impairing of the faculties of salvation and ultimately the loss of them. It really means that the very soul itself becomes piecemeal destroyed until the very capacity for God and righteousness is gone.*

"*The soul in its highest sense, is a vast capacity for God. It is like a curious chamber added on to being, and somehow involving being, a chamber with elastic and contractile walls, which can be expanded, with God as its guest, illimitably, but which without God shrinks and shrinks until every vestige of the*

Digitized by Google

Divine is gone, and God's image is left without God's Spirit. One cannot call what is left a soul; it is a shrunken, useless organ, a capacity sentenced to death by disuse, which droops as a withered hand by the side, and cumbers nature like a rotted branch. Nature has her revenge upon neglect as well as upon extravagance. Misuse, with her, is as mortal a sin as abuse." (Page 110.)

That which is stated in this most extraordinary paragraph is true neither of man *natural*, nor of man *regenerate*.

No man in his natural condition hath the Holy Spirit. Seeing, therefore, that it was never *in* him, he cannot be said to be "left by it." On the other hand, in all who are born of God through faith in Jesus, the Holy Spirit *abideth*. (See John xiv. 16.)

"Faculties" of salvation are results of salvation. They are not possessed by the unregenerate. They are the gift of God to those who are brought, through faith in Jesus, under the New Covenant of grace: and that Covenant is an everlasting Covenant (see Heb. viii.). They cannot therefore be lost. The same Covenant that preserves the persons of the regenerate, preserves their distinctive privileges. Being loved and chosen in Christ before the world was, they are in Christ "preserved." This is a sphere into which the "degeneration" of which Mr. Drummond talks can never enter.

Digitized by Google

Nor are Mr. Drummond's remarks respecting man in the natural sphere less objectionable. "*Neglect*," he says, "*does more for the soul than make it miss salvation. It despoils it of its capacity for salvation.*" Here, evidently, he is speaking of the unregenerate. By the words "*capacity for salvation*" does Mr. Drummond mean "*possibility* of salvation"—such possibility as sinful men have, but devils have not? If he mean this, his statement cannot be received, for no man who has not committed the unpardonable sin can be despoiled of the possibility of salvation while natural life continues. Sinners are not to be despoiled, nor can they despoil themselves of their title to any privilege that God has vouchsafed to them as sinners. We, as sinners, find our opportunity of salvation in the fact that God, approaching us as sinners, addresses to us *as sinners* a message of reconciliation, "preaching peace through Jesus Christ." We have, therefore, no right to say to any who have not committed the unpardonable sin, that they have forfeited their right to hear that message. We have no right to say that "neglect" or "degeneration" may cause the soul to be so "destroyed piecemeal" as to forfeit the possibility. God, whilst He continues the ministry of reconciliation, can at any moment quicken any soul that has not committed the unpardonable sin.

We cannot, however, suppose that Mr. Drummond in using the word "capacity" means "possi-

Digitized by Google

bility." His meaning approaches more nearly to that of "ability." He evidently thinks that man under right natural training may develop an *ability* to welcome God and righteousness, though he cannot, except by the operation of life from above, raise himself into the sphere of God and of righteousness. "*Man*," he says, "*is a moral animal,* "*and can, and ought to arrive at great natural* "*beauty of character. But this is simply to obey the* "*the law of his nature—the law of his flesh; and* "*no progress along that line can project him into the* "*spiritual sphere. If any one choose to claim that* "*the mineral beauty, the fleshly beauty, the natural* "*moral beauty, is all he covets, he is entitled to his* "*claim. To be good and true, pure and benevolent* "*in the moral sphere, are high, and so far legitimate,* "*objects of life. But what he is not entitled to do* "*is to call himself a Christian, or to claim to dis-* "*charge the functions peculiar to the Christian life.*" (P. 382.)

He speaks also of the soul as being "a vast capacity for God," and as having God's Spirit, and that man's elevated moral nature though it cannot "generate" Life, can "*encourage*" Life. (Page 383.) In other words, in man's natural condition there may be found a *congruity* with Life.

Now, is this assertion that "beauty of character" is naturally attainable by man, in any way compatible with the description that Scripture gives of

Digitized by Google

man natural? Is God to be the judge of "beauty of character," or is man? Is it possible for those who "have sinned, and come short of the glory of God:" "who have gone out of the way and become unprofitable:" "who are children of wrath" and "dead in trespasses and sins," to display moral beauty in the sight of God, or to be in a condition to "*encourage*" (though not to generate) Divine Life? Can persons in such a condition welcome, or have an ability, or capacity, or capability to welcome God and righteousness? If left to themselves, if not turned from their wilfulness by God, they would not welcome even pardoning love. "No man can come unto Me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." We should not welcome a Sin-bearer: a Wrath-bearer: a Substitute. We should seek a title to Life (if we sought it at all) in a condition wrought *on* us or *in* us, and not on that which is wrought *for* us. In a word, we should neglect and miss the salvation of God.

As an example of the results of the training of Nature we may take the Apostle Paul. He says himself, "If any other man think that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more." Touching the righteousness which is in the Law he was blameless. He had an apparent beauty of character to which few others could pretend, and because of it he admired himself, and was admired by others. Yet what was he? He was "the chief

Digitized by Google

of sinners." If he had done knowingly what he had done ignorantly, he would have committed the unpardonable sin, and have passed the limits of repentance. He heard Stephen's lips testify in the full power of the Holy Ghost, and saw his face shine as the face of an angel, and yet he joined in stoning him. "The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, or the leopard his spots." "Enmity to God" is the *essential* characteristic of our fallen nature. No discipline, no training, can alter it. A plague spot may be hidden: fair garments may cover it: but a plague spot it is, and a plague spot it remains. Human nature may be deteriorated, but it cannot by any training be elevated into moral nearness to God, or brought into a condition of immunity from wrath. The imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin: the guilt of a corrupted nature, and the guilt of innumerable transgressions attach to us (whatever the modification of our natural condition) as an inseparable concomitant of our natural being, and mark us as those on whom "the wrath of God *abideth*." It *abideth* until we enter by "faith in Jesus" the family of God, and then, not before, wrath gives place to acceptance. We cannot speak of there being "beauty of character" before God in those in whom God so seeth sin that wrath "*abideth*" on them. Human estimate is nothing; for "that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." The Lord Jesus said of many in whose

Digitized by Google

ways and characters their fellow-men delighted, "the publicans and harlots enter the kingdom of God before you."

"Crystallisation" (a process to which Evolutionists attach great importance in their theories of development) is referred to by Mr. Drummond in illustration of that high development to which (as he imagines) Nature can bring, whereby Life may be "*encouraged*" though not generated. It is, in fact, regarded as the consummation of a process by which the subject of such process becomes, in its lower sphere, negatively prepared for the positive action of that higher power that is to elevate it into a higher kingdom. "Crystallisation," so understood, might possibly be used as the emblem of that which, having no deteriorating qualities, lacked only Life to give development to its latent excellencies; but surely it cannot be used to denote that condition of corruption and moral death which is the natural condition of men, however ostensibly elevated. Our natural condition as men is not, and never can become, a *negative* condition in relation to evil. It is one of inherency of evil, and of positive enmity to God. "The mind of the flesh [and we have nothing else naturally] is enmity against God." It has no congruity with Life, or Holiness, or God. It is a condition of moral death, deserving and inheriting WRATH. If God approaches it without the intervention of

Digitized by Google

appeasing sacrifice, He can approach it only to consume.

Evolutionary Philosophy persistently refuses to recognise the result that must follow the awful fact that the environment of God is Living Holiness, and the environment of men, habitual activity of evil against that holiness, and against Him. The degree of the development of that evil is not the question. God knoweth, and Conscience (unless blinded) knows, that such enmity is there. The deserved and appointed doom of such enmity is wrath; and *all men* must, in one of two ways, meet it. They who meet it in their own persons, perish. They who meet it in the Person of a Substitute, live. For all those "who are of faith" a Substitute is appointed, "mighty to save"—One who has had strength to bear the wrath decreed, and at the same time to present His own tried perfectness to God, as an offering of sweet-smelling savour. This is the door through which believers enter the New Creation. They pass into Life, but not without having first passed through judicial death. "If One died instead of all [believers are spoken of] then did the whole die." Judicial Death under wrath is that which stands between fallen man and God. Met in Christ, it is the gateway to Life: met otherwise, it bringeth to "the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the Second Death." Evolutionary Religion hideth all this. It has

Digitized by Google

invented a way to Life which the Scripture knows not.

XVI. "*The lilies grow of themselves; they toil not, neither do they spin. They grow, that is, automatically, spontaneously, without trying, without fretting, without thinking. Applied in any direction, to plant, to animal, to the body or to the soul, this law holds. A boy grows, for example, without trying. One or two simple conditions are fulfilled, and the growth goes on. He thinks probably as little about the condition as about the result; he fulfils the conditions by habit, the result follows by nature. Both processes go steadily on from year to year apart from himself and all but in spite of himself. One would never think of* TELLING *a boy to grow. A doctor has no prescription for growth. He can tell me how growth may be stunted or impaired, but the process itself is recognised as beyond control—one of the few, and therefore very significant, things which Nature keeps in her own hands. No physician of souls, in like manner, has any prescription for spiritual growth. It is the question he most often asked and most often answers wrongly. He may prescribe more earnestness, more prayer, more self-denial, or more Christian work. These are prescriptions for something, but not for growth. Not that they may not encourage growth; but the soul grows as the lily grows, without trying, without fretting, without ever thinking.*" (Page 126.)

Digitized by Google

The Philosophic School pride themselves on their *deep*-thinking. They do not, however, seem to be pre-eminently distinguished by *clear*-thinking.* In the paragraph now quoted, *power* or *capacity* of growth, is evidently confounded with *developed growth.* God gives to the lily, and to the child, and to all whom He *new*-creates for the Spiritual World, a capacity of growth suited to their respective conditions; for He only is the Creator. In the inanimate creation He, for the most part, is the alone agent in providing all that is needed for bringing the latent powers of growth into development; but in the rational and responsible sphere He employs instrumental agencies requiring thought, labour, and concurrency of action in others. The child may not think about that which may be needful for the development of its powers. But what if others did not think about it, and instruct the child, as its age advanced, to think about it himself? What if the child were placed in a pit, or on a mountain's top, and neglected? His parents or friends (although they never think

* How can it be otherwise? They who reason deeply about things too high for them, "do find no end in wandering mazes lost." They who know most, and that under the true teaching of God, know only "in part" (1 Cor. xiii. 9): and as to the world, its wisdom is foolishness with God. They, therefore, who are, in human estimate, deep thinkers, cannot be clear thinkers! They must think themselves into perplexity.

Digitized by Google

about giving *power* of growth), yet certainly do think, and that unceasingly, about providing those things which are needed for the development of growth. So is it in respect of "the new man created according to God." Constant and assiduous care is needed. Hence the charge of the Lord Jesus to Peter: "Feed my lambs." "Be the shepherd of my sheep." They need food, and they need guidance. Hence the charge given to the sheep themselves, to "desire the unadulterated milk of the word (*το λογικον αδολον γαλα*) that ye might grow thereby." (1 Peter ii. 2.) And again, "Giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue, and to virtue, knowledge, and to knowledge, temperance," and the like, in order that ye might not be "barren or unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Peter i. 5, 6.) In the face of passages such as these (and like passages might be indefinitely multiplied) shall we say that the soul grows, as the body grows, "*without trying, without fretting, without ever thinking*"? Certainly the Apostle felt far otherwise when he said to the Ephesians, "Therefore watch, and remember, that for the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." (Acts xx. 31.) The gifts which the great Head of the Church received for His people, and dispensed when He ascended up on high, were gifts of ministry. "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors

Digitized by Google

and teachers, with reference [προς] to the perfecting of the saints to the work of ministration (διακονιας) . . . that we be henceforth no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about by every wind of doctrine . . . but might GROW." (Eph. iv. 11, etc.) Christ does not expect His people to grow without care, and without thought. "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus."

Yet Mr. Drummond says: "*Truth in the doctrinal form is not natural, proper, assimilable food for the soul of man.*" (Page 364.) No doubt he is right in saying this, if the soul is to grow "without thinking." The Apostle, however, thought otherwise, when he said to Timothy: "Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me." (2 Tim. i. 13.) And again, "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to DOCTRINE." (1 Tim. iv. 13.) "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the DOCTRINE." (1 Tim. iv. 16.) "Charge some that they teach no other DOCTRINE." (1 Tim. i. 3.) The Apostle John says: "Whosoever transgresseth* and abideth not in the DOCTRINE of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the DOCTRINE of Christ, he hath both the Father and

* The more ancient reading is ὁ προαγων—he that advanceth or leadeth forward.

Digitized by Google

the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this DOCTRINE, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." (2 John 9, 10.) Did not the Lord Jesus say, "If ye continue in my WORD, then are ye my disciples indeed"? And again, "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." And, again "Sanctify them by thy Truth: thy WORD is Truth." There can be no true sanctification apart from the Truth; and that Truth is found in the Bible alone.

The very object of the Scripture is to announce Truth in a doctrinal form. The Bible is God's Law—His תּוֹרָה, His Directory; that by which He *points out* the way for the steps of His people. His utterances are authoritative, demanding implicit subjection on the ground that He who speaks is all-wise, and knoweth all things. We exercise our understandings in ascertaining what it is that He hath declared; but seeing that we know only "in part," we expect not to understand any subject of His revelation perfectly. Nevertheless, no room remains for doubt as to the absolute truth of any thing which we know that God hath spoken. To this statement, however, Mr. Drummond would demur. He advocates "*that philosophic doubt, which is the evidence of a faculty doing its own work.*' (P. 364.) At one moment we are told that the soul is to grow "without thinking": at another, we

Digitized by Google

are encouraged philosophically to doubt. There seems some inconsistency here. The latter, however, would, no doubt, be Mr. Drummond's prescription; for he deems the office of Philosophy to be to "recast Truth," and to "purify Theology." The result of his system of purification may be seen from such a sentiment as this: "*It is more necessary to be active than orthodox.*" The Lord Jesus in His reply to Martha taught otherwise: "Mary hath chosen that good part that shall not be taken away from her." "If a man strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned, except he strive lawfully." There can be no lawful striving where the Word of God is not acknowledged and used as the one only Rule.

Mr. Drummond in page 360 complains that "*in Theology, Truth is propositional . . . that the Atonement is a formule which is to be demonstrated like a proposition in Euclid. And Justification is to be worked out as a question of Jurisprudence.*" I reply that "a form of sound words," clear and intelligible, is required in spiritual, quite as much as in natural things. Gainsayers there ever have been, and ever will be, till the flesh ceases to be: therefore, when gainsayers dispute and cavil, it is necessary that the servants of God should define the sense properly attaching to the words which they employ. "Ambiguities," says the Saxon Confession, "are to be avoided in the Church of God." No doctrine that cannot be proved from *axioms supplied by Scripture* as certainly as a mathematical proposition

Digitized by Google

founded on mathematical axioms, can be received, much less enforced: and the Jurisprudence of the Courts of God when revealed in His Holy Word (and it *is* there revealed) is as needful to be explained and recognised, as the Jurisprudence of the Courts of man. Otherwise, there could be no Law, no Order, no Government. Men in the Church, and in the world, would become "like the fishes of the sea, like creeping things that have no ruler over them." The idiosyncracies of individuals would strive for mastery; and a moral chaos would be the result—a result that is being accelerated by all who are departing, and luring away others from the sure guidance of the Word of God.

It is greatly to be regretted, too, that in questions so solemn and momentous as those we are considering, Mr. Drummond should not be more careful in his methods of illustration. *Το σεμνον* (that which is *dignified, venerable* and *solemn*) is one of the requirements of the Holy Ghost. See Philippians iv. 8: *ὁσα εστιν αληθη, ὁσα ΣΕΜΝΑ.* It is revolting in connexion with subjects so holy, to hear about "a greengrocer's shop window," and to find the distinctions which the servants of God are commanded to make between the various classes of His holy truths whilst "rightly dividing" His Word, compared to the distinctions which a shopman draws between "a Magnum-bonum, and a Victoria, or a Baldwin and a Newtown Pippin." (See p. 364.) No one who gives to the Bible,

Digitized by Google

and to Bible-truth, their right place, could by any possibility, write thus.*

Besides, the illustration is altogether misleading. The Bible is neither an orchard nor a mart, nor are God's servants, whom He sends to explain it, salesmen. The Bible is the voice of God speaking authoritatively in the midst of a wide world, in which darkness, corruption, and confusion reign. There are "vessels to honour, and vessels unto dishonour"; wells of Truth and wells of Falsehood; fruits of Heaven and fruits of Hell; strongholds of God and strongholds of the Devil. The servants of God have to stand in the midst of these things, and in the light, and with the authority of God's Word, to proclaim His will, and to separate

---

*The words of Mr. Drummond are: "It (Theology) does what the greengrocer does when he arranges his apples and plums in his shop window. He may tell me a magnum bonum from a Victoria, or a Baldwin from a Newtown Pippin. But he does not help me to eat it. His information is useful, and for scientific horticulture essential. Should a sceptical pomologist deny that there was such a thing as a Baldwin, or mistake it for a Newtown Pippin, we should be glad to refer to him; but if we were hungry, and an orchard were handy, we should not trouble him. Truth in the Bible is an orchard rather than a Museum. Dogmatism will be very useful when scientific necessity makes us go to the museum. Criticism will be very useful in seeing that only fruit-bearers grow in the orchard. But truth in the doctrinal (?) form is not natural, proper, assimilable food for the soul of man." (P. 364).

Digitized by Google

the precious from the vile. The Bible is the Directory of God to those who have to do as much with the trees of the Devil's planting as with those of God's planting, and with countless marts of things evil, and things good, in which, however, the evil vastly predominates. How a soul that *thinks not* is to grow in the midst of a scene like this, I fail to comprehend.

XVII. "*Wilt thou ever permit thyself to be conformed to the Image of the Son?*" (Page 308.)

"*Wilt thou, who canst not add one cubit unto thy stature, submit to be raised by the Type-life within thee to the perfect stature of Christ?*" (Idem.)

"*The soul grows as the lily grows, without trying, without fretting, without ever thinking.*" (Page 127.)

There can scarcely be a more striking example of the misinterpretation and misapplication of Scripture than is found in the sentences prefixed. When "the Lord shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God"—when "this corruption shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality"—*then*, not before, shall the redeemed, in the twinkling of an eye, be "conformed to the Image of the Son," and "be made like Him, seeing Him as He is." It will be no gradual process—no process to which we can be said to "submit," and "per-

Digitized by Google

mit" ourselves to be subjects of. It will be a sudden act of Christ's *glorious* power, that power by whose mighty working He will subdue all things unto Himself. Here, indeed, there is, on our part, entire passivity, quite as great as when the mineral is *supposed* to be formed into the vegetable; but we could not speak of *submitting* or *permitting* ourselves to be the subjects of a power that is to quicken and glorify the dead. Such power is something very different from the working "of a type-life *within* us" to which (it is supposed) we may refuse conformity.

Mr. Drummond has thought so entirely apart from Scripture, that he not only fails to distinguish between the various agencies that are appointed at different times to bear upon the redeemed, but he also extends to the unredeemed, agencies that belong only to the redeemed. "Vain and preposterous" men who refuse to submit to the operations of God, and to permit themselves to be acted on by Him must be numbered among the unregenerate: yet they are spoken of by Mr. Drummond as having the type-life "*within*" them.

I have already referred to the attempts that are being made to make *passivity* the great characteristic of the life of the regenerate. It is an attempt most earnestly to be resisted. As regards "the *creation* of the new man" in us, we are indeed passive—as passive as Adam was when the breath of natural life was breathed into his nostrils. But

Digitized by Google

when the new man has been created in us, new powers of thought, feeling and action, are communicated, and sustained in us by the indwelling power of the Spirit as the Paraclete. These powers it is our duty as well as privilege, to exercise with all diligence. Energy and activity are elements in our new being. Where Life is, there must be activity. Being "alive in the Spirit," we are commanded to walk in the Spirit. (See Gal. v. 25.) Accordingly, we read of "divine power having been given to us in all things that pertain to life and godliness."* "I speak," said the Apostle, "unto wise men; judge ye what I say." "In malice be ye children, but in understanding be ye men." These, and a hundred like texts show, that there is no "passivity"; no suspension of our energies here. On the contrary, an energetic use of our new powers of thought and action is demanded. We act *with* and *under* God—acting when He requires action—ceasing when He requires cessation. Trust in God is perfectly compatible with action on our part. David diligently prepared his sling and his stones, though he trusted neither in the strength of his arm to sling, nor in his own power to guide or give effect to the action of the stone when it was slung. The presence of Christ through His Spirit in our soul does not (as mystic,

* Ὡς παντα ἡμιν της θειας δυναμεως αυτου τα προς ζωην και ευσεβειαν δεδωρημενης. (2 Peter i. 3.)

Digitized by Google

and philosophic Christianity teach) supersede or suspend the action of what they are wont to call "*the ego-life*" in us. On the contrary, it calls into action our *new* Life, and stimulates and directs our new powers. The very object of the indwelling presence of the Spirit is to excite and sustain the energies of our new Life. No one more than the Apostle Paul appreciated the great truth that Christ lived in him; yet he seldom, if ever, refers to that truth without referring also to the exercise of his own power of simultaneous and concurrent action. Again, and again, he speaks of the life which he himself lives in the flesh, and of the responsibility attaching to himself as thus living. "Herein do I exercise myself to have always a conscience void of offence toward God and toward men." (Acts xxiv. 16.) And again, "whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working that worketh in me mightily." Many possibly who read these lines will remember the oft-told tale about the idiot child who performed her difficult exercise of bell-ringing with absolute perfectness, because the master of the school held and guided her hand throughout, so that nothing was left to the child's spontaneous or concurrent action. She was simply and only a machine. Of this tale Perfectionists are fond: but the Apostles would have indignantly rejected the illustration. They would have said that it utterly set aside the responsibility

Digitized by Google

of Christian action. Equally would they have condemned the statement that the soul can grow "without ever thinking." Evolutionary Philosophy, whilst it persists in maintaining that by Natural Law minerals are evolved into vegetables, beasts, and men; and maintains also that men are raised into Spiritual being by a like operation of the *same* Law that has evolved them from lower forms of existence, *must* (if it preserve the semblance of consistency) maintain also that the subject of evolution must, throughout the process, be *passive.*

There can indeed be no doubt that the doctrine of "Perfectionism" in one of its most objectionable forms is taught by Evolutionary Religion. If "the Christ-life" forms the passive soul, according to the same laws that are supposed to regulate "the pigeon-life" in forming the passive pigeon, no doubt a *perfect* formation will be the result. The idiot child performed her exercise perfectly because her hand was guided perfectly. There was no responsibility: she did not "ever think." When nothing impedes the action of a competent agent, perfectness must be the result. Yet the Apostle said, "in many things we all offend" (James iii. 2); and the Scripture speaks of a High Priest who ever liveth to make intercession for us and to bear the iniquity of our holy things. (See Exodus xxviii. 38, and Hebrews vii. 25.) We should not need such intercession or such bearing of iniquity if we were so perfected as to be without sin.

Digitized by Google

In the Evolutionary *religious* system now proposed, there is an ominous resemblance to Romanism, Spiritualism, Mysticism, and other less known systems, which (in order to secure implicit obedience in their disciples) impress on them the duty of self-immolation, which includes among other things the renunciation of our own powers of understanding, conscience and will, and the rendering unqualified submission to some Body, or Individual, or System, or Principle, whose claims are too high to be questioned, and can be satisfied by nothing short of passive recognition and obedience. Romanism has as yet been the chief sphere in which the deadly effects of such submission have been manifested. These results (pregnant though they be with ruin) the apathy and stupefaction of nominal Protestantism has, of late years, persistently refused to recognise. We cannot wonder, therefore, that when examples of like delusion are elsewhere found they should fail to alarm. The awful effects of "Mesmerism," "Willing," and "Spiritualism" in all their forms, are to be seen on every side. Spiritualism in all its developments requires passivity. The action of our own wills must be suspended. We must deliver ourselves over to the control of the will of another. Neology directs to a verifying faculty within. Philosophic Mysticism too looks to a Light and Power *within* for enlightenment, guidance, and authoritative direction. Scripture is not

Digitized by Google

recognised as the one authoritative test of all voices. And now Evolutionary Religion virtually joins the circle by teaching the doctrine of passivity, and saying that our great duty is "to *permit* ourselves to be conformed" to Christ's image; and "*to submit to be raised by the Type-life within us*" to the perfect stature of Christ. "The soul grows as the lily grows, without trying, without fretting, without ever thinking." A soul that grows thus will surely grow into darkness—not into light.

To refuse to use the faculties which God has given us, and to sink ourselves into a condition of passivity when God requires watchfulness and activity, is a sin of exceeding heinousness, and entails (if permitted) dangers from which nothing but God's sovereign grace can extricate.

Man, even in his natural condition, has certain powers which God expects and commands him to exercise. The exercise of those powers will not deliver him from the indwelling presence of Sin, or enable him to attain acceptance with God; yet if he refuse to exercise those powers he will bring himself into increased hardness of heart, and into further distance from God. All men's natural powers are impaired by sin. His understanding is darkened; his conscience deadened; his will enslaved. Nevertheless, there are certain things which an enfeebled eye can see, and an imperfectly hearing ear can hear. I may present to a man

Digitized by Google

that verse in Genesis which declares that God created every tree and plant before it grew and produced creation in its perfectness. I may present to him God's description of the manner in which Adam and Eve were created, and other like histories and facts. The man has by his understanding, power to apprehend that God has propounded these facts. His conscience may tell him that God being the God of Truth, would not have declared these things if they were not strictly true. His conviction of the truth of these things will not in itself bring him nearer to God; but his rejection of them will involve him in the guilt of deeper rebellion. If the voice of Science, or any other voice bewitch him—if he say, I will forego the exercise of my understanding, and my conscience, and will hear the voice that lures me away from God's Word, he abandons God. He rejects Him as the God of Truth: he rejects Him as the God of righteousness, for it would be unrighteous to deceive by a false statement: he rejects Him as a God of love, for love could not knowingly guide into falsehood. And if God demands from men as men the exercise of the power He has naturally given them, must He not equally demand that those to whom He has given new understanding and new powers—those in whom He has created the New Man, "*renewed for knowledge* after the image of Him that created him"—must He not expect from such

Digitized by Google

the diligent and watchful exercise of their new powers? Surely there can be no passivity here. He requires intelligent activity—activity guided by His Word, whereby all things are to be tested, even the utterances of an angel from heaven. "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

In finding our way through the perplexing and dangerous mazes which we have to meet in the past and present course of Christendom, we shall often encounter individuals and systems of high spiritual pretension, that claim to have attained a higher path than others, and who not unfrequently say that their voice is the voice of the Spirit of God. Without examination we are to reject nothing. "Prove all things," says the Apostle. Antecedently, it is not only possible, but probable, that others may have advanced further in the paths of Christ than we, and the rightly humbled soul will not refuse to listen whenever words of apparent truth and wisdom are proffered. But we need a test. What if we had nothing whereby to try the thoughts, and feelings, and doctrines which Satan (acting it may be as an angel of light) may bring into our bosoms, or which may come there from the suggestion of others whom we have been wont to love or to value? If we had no test, we should find ourselves in the dungeon of despair: for who can count the multitude of voices that clamour around

Digitized by Google

us. What if we had nothing that enables us calmly to hear them, and resolutely to say, "We know." God has graciously given us that test in giving us His written Word. We use it, and we find that it adequately tests all things. So we know the liberty with which Christ maketh free. Otherwise a yoke of bondage grievous and destructive is imposed upon us, the weight and terribleness of which none who have not experienced it can estimate. There is nothing, therefore, against which we have more to guard ourselves, and warn others, than the maxim, "Think not." "The Son of God hath come, and hath given us an understanding that we might know." "He that is spiritual estimateth (*ανακρινει*) all things." "God has given us the spirit of power, and of a sound mind." We have to think with all our powers, and act with all our energies, saying, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Ps. cxix. 105.)

At first sight it might appear that this doctrine of passive submission is at utter variance with that which Mr. Drummond elsewhere says respecting the mortification of sin and the like; but the discrepancy is apparent merely. According to Mr. Drummond's system, the Christ-Life acts on a previously elevated and improved human nature, which is subsequently further elevated and drawn up into a higher sphere of being, where it gradually advances until it finds itself in a state of perfected

Digitized by Google

correspondency with God. Whilst thus being elevated, perpetual activity is needed; but that activity is supplied, sustained, and controlled, independently of ourselves and our thoughts. The Christ-Life acts—not we. Our part is passive submission. If that be not wanting, the result is sure. The Bird-Life makes the bird: the Christ-Life the Christian. So "the soul grows as the lily grows, without ever thinking."

The Scripture, however, teaches otherwise. It teaches that human nature before it is quickened, is not brought by civilization, educational training, or any other agency, into nearer correspondency with God. Nor does the Holy Ghost act upon our fallen nature immediately, but mediately. God does not deliver our fallen Adamic nature from the tainting presence of Sin. He creates in us "the New man," and through its energies, sustained by His Spirit, He controls and restrains "the Old man," but He does not purify *it*. "The Old man" is never brought into suitability to, or into correspondency with, God. On the contrary, until it cease to be, it vigorously resists God—being enmity against Him. Each individual saint, therefore, is quickened and justified when ungodly, on the ground of what Another has substitutionally done. To those who are thus justified, the Holy Ghost comes as the Paraclete to dwell in them, and to sustain and develop the energies of the New man. The power that bears on us is

Digitized by Google

from the Holy Ghost, but it acts not apart from, but *through* and *with* our new personal powers. In every action our new personal powers of thought and action are called into development. We deliberate, discriminate, and choose. If we listen to our Shepherd's voice, and feed under His care we thrive. If we wander and feed on fouled pastures, we pine and are chastened. If we build what is precious on the one foundation, we receive a reward: if we build stubble on that foundation, we shall suffer loss. The knowledge of these things causes the instructed believer "to think," and that continually—it may be with groanings and tears. Yet the consciousness that great responsibility rests upon him, that he has to reflect, determine and act, does not make him independent of the guidance of the Shepherd, and Bishop, and Physician of his soul. It does not cause him to forget the throne of grace, nor to despise "the timely aid" ready to be extended thence. No one leaned more on his Lord and Master than the Apostle Paul. No one depended more than he on his Master's love, faithfulness and strength. At the same time, no one was more conscious of his own personal responsibilities—no one more anxious that his understanding, conscience, and affections, should be daily exercised and kept under the constant enlightenment of the Word of God. To think and to act concurrently with his Master was his great desire; and it was fulfilled;

Digitized by Google

for whilst trusting always, and praying always, he fought the good fight, kept the faith, and finished his course with joy. He never expected his soul to grow simply by the action of a superior power upon it, "without thinking."

Mr. Drummond is fond of insisting on the necessity of man being brought into right correspondency with environments that are higher than his own natural environments; and many things that he says on that subject are too obviously true to be questioned. Unless we are brought into right correspondency with God, it is very evident that all must be wrong with us. One thing necessary to being brought into such correspondency is that we should, with child-like hearts, receive God's teaching respecting things past, and present, and to come. That teaching reaches us through His written Word. Exactly in proportion as we fail in correspondency of thought with God touching the things He has revealed, we fail in true communion with Him, and in true holiness.

Of all the agencies that have yet appeared in the professing Church, mighty to hinder such correspondency with God, there are few, if any, more potent than the influences of Evolutionary Philosophy, especially in its new *religious* garb. Beginning with the first two chapters of God's Word, it quietly cancels them. And yet, those two chapters contain the *roots* of all God's revealed Truth. There we find the history, not only of the origin

Digitized by Google

and creation of the Universe, but the history of Man's creation also, and his relation to that Universe, and the history of his Fall, and of all that that Fall involved in introducing Sin and Death, and causing the governmental relation of God to His creature man to become one of "judgment unto condemnation," leading to the second Death. The effect of a representative man's sin (for Adam was a Representative Person) is seen in the Fall having brought upon ruined humanity a night of gloom and darkness, which no ray of light would have penetrated if God had not provided One, who in due time appeared and became also a Representative Person, bringing in Life on the same principle on which Adam brought in Death. The *roots*, therefore, of the Dispensational actings of God for judgment, and for mercy, are found in the facts recorded in the commencing chapters of Genesis. We might as well expect the trunk of a tree, from which we had cut off all its roots to grow, as imagine that the Revealed Truth of God can be taught if the facts revealed in the commencing chapters of Genesis are to be set aside as fables, or to be nullified by non-natural interpretation. Those chapters must as a whole stand, or as a whole fall. If one part be false, all may be false: and the whole of God's Word is discredited because it claims for itself truthfulness *as a whole*. Destroy the testimony of Moses and you destroy the testimony of Christ; for

Digitized by Google

Christ bore witness to Moses. Evolutionary Philosophy cancels Genesis, and with it cancels the Bible. Can any who do this be in correspondency with the Divine environments? Are they not adversaries?

Six thousand years nearly have now passed, since fallen man began to spread his influence over the earth, and to give to it what we are accustomed to call "Civilisation." The character of this Civilisation is sufficiently marked by such names as Nimrod, Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander, Cæsar, and finally Antichrist. Sacerdotalism has added its Caiaphases, Patriarchs, and Popes. Modern Philosophy has swollen the list by that terrible catalogue of names that are chronicled in Mr. Drummond's book, as if they were the world's benefactors.* The result of all this agency Mr. Drummond contemplates with complacency. "The "world," he says (p. 277), "is about as good a "world as might be. It has been long in the "making, its furniture is all in, its laws are in "perfect working order; and although wise men "at various times have suggested improvements,

* Among these may be mentioned, Aurora Leigh, Herbert Spenser, Frank Harrison, Huxley, Sir W. R. Grove, Descartes, Tyndall, Darwin, Leslie Stephens, the author of "Ecce Homo," Reuss, Emerson, Carlyle, and many others, all referred to with more or less approval. He commends "the eloquent preaching of 'The Gospel of Work,' by Thomas Carlyle," without adding one word of censure, or even warning.

Digitized by Google

"there is on the whole a tolerably unanimous vote "of confidence in things as they exist. The Divine "environment has little more to do for this planet, "as far as we can see, and so far as the existing "generation is concerned. Then the lower organic "life of the world is also so far complete. God, "through evolution, or otherwise, may still have "finishing touches to add here and there, but already "it is 'all very good.'"* Mr. Drummond's judgment of "Civilisation" may be learned from the following passage: "To evolution certainly all men "will look for a further perfecting of Life. But "it must be an evolution which includes all the "factors. Civilisation it may be said will deal "with the second factor. It will improve the environment step by step as it improves the organism, "or the organism as it improves the environment. "This is well, and will perfect Life up to a point." (P. 281.) Thus in the past, and present, and future history of "Civilisation," Mr. Drummond sees light, not darkness. He speaks of it as one of the great factors in progress, and as one of the agents of elevating humanity into a condition in which it will be meet for being acted on from above, and brought into correspondency with God.

Such is the judgment of Mr. Drummond respecting the World's Civilisation. No doubt Evolu-

* I am aware that I have already quoted this passage, but it is well that attention should be further drawn to it.

Digitized by Google

tionary Philosophy will smile derisively when we oppose to this opinion the testimony of the Word of God. They who despise that testimony as respects the World's origin, will not be disposed to listen to it respecting the World's progress and end. If Genesis, which speaks of the beginning, be despised, we must expect that those parts of Scripture which speak of its end (especially "the Revelation") will be despised also. Yet it is an awful thing to despise a book of which the Lord Jesus has said, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches. . . . . I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City, and from the things that are written in this book." (Rev. xxii. 16, etc.) There are some who still reverence the testimonies of this Holy Book, and to them I would briefly say, that one of its chief objects is to throw the light of Heaven on the condition of the world and its civilisation at the moment that immediately precedes the manifestation of the glory of the Kingdom of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Whatever "Babylon" and "The Beast" may mean, they are certainly names which are

Digitized by Google

appended to the last forms of human Civilisation as characteristic of its condition at the time of the end; and they are unquestionably names of curse —not of blessing. The first recorded Alleluiah of Heaven respects the fall of the harlot City. "I heard a great voice of much people in Heaven, saying, Alleluiah; Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God: for true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluiah. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever." (Rev. xix. 1, 2, 3.) And respecting the Beast we read: "If any man worship the Beast or his Image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the Beast and his Image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." (Rev. xiv. 9, etc.) Such is the end of that Civilisation which Mr. Drummond thinks to be one of the chief factors in advancing man, and bringing him nearer to God, and which has made, or is

Digitized by Google

making, the world "about as good a world as might be." Yet God tells us that its origin was in the family of Cain, and that its end will be in the pit, where it will inherit His everlasting judgments. But to all the warnings that God has given respecting these things, Evolutionary Philosophy gives no heed. Mr. Drummond refuses to believe in "eternal judgment." Man, in soul as well as body, is, according to him, to fade like the leaf and perish. There is to be no resurrection of the body: and yet the Apostle tells us that if there be no resurrection Christ hath not been raised; in which case the Apostles must have borne witness to a lie. Surely it must be evident that all who think and speak thus, can have no correspondency with God. They have mistaken a light of their own kindling for the light of God. And what will they meet with from His hand? "They shall lie down in sorrow." (See Isaiah l. 11.)

It is obvious that Christianity perishes, if the doctrine of the Resurrection be untrue. The Apostles, we are told, "preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead." (Acts iv. 2.) If that doctrine be false, their testimony was false. "If there be no resurrection of the body," said the Apostle, "we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified against God (*κατα θεου*) that He raised up Christ, whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead

Digitized by Google

rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain. Ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. xv. 15.) If we can "dispense with the theological thesis of a miraculous corporeal reconstruction of our person as something absolutely opposed to reason," * then we may maintain that there will be no resurrection of "those who are Christ's at His Coming," no millennial reign, no heavenly or earthly glory, no final resurrection and judgment, no eternal glory, no eternal torment. All that the Scripture commands us to believe will have to be abandoned as a myth—a vain deceit, and as I have already said, Christianity perishes.

Moreover, if there be no Resurrection, the Son of God cannot have died in the manner declared in Scripture, and therefore there can have been no Atonement. The rejection of Atonement *as taught in the Scripture* is indeed a necessary corollary of the Evolutionary doctrine, in whatever form presented. All evolutionary progress,

---

* The words of Reuss, quoted with approval by Mr. Drummond, are: "It" (the true doctrine) "can dispense both with the philosophical thesis of the immateriality or indestructibility of the human soul, and with the theological thesis of a miraculous corporeal reconstruction of our person; theses, the first of which is altogether foreign to the religion of the Bible, and the second absolutely opposed to reason." (P. 236.)

Digitized by Google

according to Mr. Drummond's system, is *towards Life.* Whereas, as we have already seen, the doom of man is death and judgment. Every man must meet judicial Death under wrath, either in his own person, or else in the Person of his Substitute. In the one case he inherits everlasting torment, in the other everlasting glory. Evolutionary Philosophy buries out of sight all that Scripture teaches respecting WRATH: and with it buries the Gospel of our Salvation; for it hides Christ as the WRATH-BEARER. He may be the Giver of Life; but not the Curse-bearer.

We exceed not the limits of truth when we say that Evolutionary Philosophy quenches every thing that God has revealed in the Bible, respecting the operations of His power, past, present, and to come, both in the Kingdom of Nature, and in the Kingdom of Grace. Yet nothing can exceed its high pretensions. It offers to guide into the very highest paths of self-denial, holiness, and *perfection.* Absalom-like it points out and magnifies the weaknesses, sins and failures of the true servants of God; Absalom-like, with smooth and goodly words, it proposes paths and remedies which lead to the abandonment of God, and of all that God bids us value. It preaches self-mortification, and at the same moment hesitates not to arouse and stimulate those "desires of the mind" which cause men "to reply against God," and to rebel against the

Digitized by Google

authority of His Word—carnal desires which it is the first great object of true self-mortification to subdue. It speaks, too, of losing our lives in this world; and yet lauds the world's order; rejoices in the world's civilisation; and regards that civilisation as one of the chief factors in bringing men nearer to God. One might suppose that it had never read the words, "Be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing (*τῃ ανακαινωσει*) of your minds." The mind of "the new man" it silences; and as to avoiding conformity with the present age, the present age is the very creature of its hand—the cherished object of its affections. Philosophy ever hated the reproach of Christ's Truth. It loves to walk in high places. Yet every one who seeks to lose his life in this world must have his steps turned towards the Cave of Adullam—else he will never have correspondency with the thoughts and ways of the true David.

The history of Christendom supplies us with many an example of attempts to find the way of holiness, made by persons who neglect or reject the truths of Redemption as revealed in Scripture. Fully do I admit the urgent necessity (especially in a time of laxity and compromise like the present) of seeking diligently to be in all things separate to God and to His service. Again, and again, the Scripture charges us to resist Sin, and to strive against all its workings, both *in* us, and *around* us.

Digitized by Google

Nowhere, however, are we told to *kill* Sin. We cannot *kill* Sin in ourselves any more than we can *kill* it in the world. How is it then that Mr. Drummond says: "If the Christian will live unto God he must die unto sin. *If he does not kill sin, sin will inevitably kill him.*" (P. 182.) The Christian will reply; Sin has already killed me. I died when my Substitute and Representative died. (See Rom. vi. 1—11.) This indeed is the uniform testimony of the Scripture respecting all "the Household of faith." "One died instead of all [believers are spoken of], accordingly the whole DIED."* "Therefore *we reckon* ourselves dead to Sin, and alive unto God." *We reckon* ourselves dead, because representatively (though not personally) we have passed through judicial death under wrath: on that ground we say, "we died:" we have been "crucified." (Gal. ii. 20.) The title to kill us that Sin once had is for ever cancelled; and further, God is pleased to assure us that Sin shall never have dominion, or lordship, over us again. "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace." (Rom. vi. 14.) The knowledge of this past, completed death unto Sin, is absolutely necessary to all who would walk in God's path of holiness. Else we shall be labouring to attain to

* Εις ὑπερ παντων απεθανεν, αρα οἱ παντες απεθανον. (2 Cor. v. 16.)

Digitized by Google

a condition that is already our's through God's gift to us in Christ—a condition which we by no possible effort of our own could ever have attained. God (by associating all who belong to the family of faith whether weak or strong with the results of the death and resurrection of their Substitute) has effectually placed them above the power of Sin, and Satan, and every other enemy—all having been so effectually conquered for them, that nothing can separate them from God, and from His love. The knowledge of this is a spring and a stay to them in all their strivings after holiness, and gives a peaceful buoyancy of spirit which storms and conflicts fail to destroy. A sure Title to glory founded on the finished oblation of their Substitute has been given them, and that Title brings with it the gift of many present blessings, such as the creation of the new man in us, and the indwelling presence of the Holy Ghost as the witness and pledge of the fulness of grace bestowed on them in Christ risen. Thus armoured they can fight. But Mr. Drummond's system fails to supply this armour. There is no element of fixedness or certainty in it. When nothing stable has been reached, and when our hope rests merely on certain future developments that are dependent on the will and acquiescence of the creature, what expectation can there be except the expectation of ruin? The Evolutionary system has no room

Digitized by Google

for Atonement as taught in the Scripture. Life from above, elevating and purifying a consenting humanity without the intervention of judicial substitutional Death, is the characteristic principle of the pseudo-religious system that Evolution proposes. It is a system which quite as much as any other branch of Neology hides the *criminality* of Sin. It may in some sort, recognise Sin as a disease requiring remedy, but it refuses to recognise it as an offence against God's holiness and God's government, deserving and entailing WRATH. It fails also to distinguish between Indwelling Sin as a principle, and Sin as transgression. An example of this may be seen in Mr. Drummond's remarks on what he is pleased to call moral "Suicide." It is quite true that there are occasions when a Christian may find it necessary to cut off that which may be as dear to him as his right hand in order to avoid some deadly snare. Whenever such a step be *necessary*, the Christian will certainly be enabled through the gracious care of a covenant God, to take it. God's sheep have a Shepherd—a Shepherd kind and gracious, having "bowels and mercies" as well as almighty power. But such an act is not an act of "suicide." A Christian neither kills himself by so acting, nor does he kill Sin. He avoids a specific act of transgression, but his old moral nature remains unchanged. Sin in him does not die. In the power of "the new man," through the

Digitized by Google

Spirit, he resists Sin that is in him, and so far conquers it; but he does not kill it, or kill himself. Standing, as it were, by the side of God, he fights under God against his natural self. This, in the estimate of a believer, is victory rather than suicide. Indeed, the Scripture knows nothing of "Suicide." When Sin within us is actually annihilated, a greater than ourselves will effect it by His own unaided and almighty power. *

Mr. Drummond tells us that "the conscious hour of the second birth is probably in the case of an

---

* The very word "mortify" (which is that which the Scripture uses) proves that Sin in us is not killed: for we cannot mortify that which is dead. As regards our bodies, the Scripture never tells us either to kill, or to neglect them. In Colossians ii. 23 the Apostle borrows the words of those whom he is condemning, when stating the plea used by them in defence of their ascetism. We neglect our bodies (said they) because we will not hold them "in honour to the satisfying of the flesh." This was their pretence. The servant of God replies; We too refuse to hold our bodies in honour *to the satisfying of the flesh:* but we refuse also to neglect them. We desire so far to hold them in honour as to cherish them for the service of God; that so they might be a living sacrifice. "Life unto God" is the first motto of the Christian. Whatever hinders such life, should be mortified or abandoned: whatever promotes it, should be cherished, Scripture being in all cases the rule by which every thing is tested.

Digitized by Google

adult defined by his first real victory over sin." Lydia and the jailer at Philippi, and the Eunuch in the wilderness, and the thousands who believed at Pentecost, did not think so. They did not wait till their first practical victory over sin to realise their changed condition. They rejoiced because they had found a Saviour. They were "born again" (*αναγεγεννημενοι*) by means of "the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," even that Word, says the Apostle, which is by the Gospel preached unto you. (1 Peter i. 23.) "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." Faith in, and confession of, Christ as declared in the Word of God, is the Scripture-evidence of Regeneration. To anxious and distressed souls nothing can be more important than the clear recognition of this great and blessed truth. The highest link in the chain of salvation links with glory; but the awakened soul desires to know to what depth the chain descends, and where it connects itself with our need and misery. The Scripture tells us that it comes down to the low level of our sin; meets us there as ungodly, and justifies us through faith. (See Romans iv. 5.) The Scripture, therefore, pronounces him to be regenerate who has believed in and confessed the name and work of the Lord Jesus. Mr. Drummond, on the contrary, bids us seek the evidence

Digitized by Google

of regeneration in our "first victory over sin." In that case our claim to be numbered among the regenerate must rest, not on Christ's work, but on our work. The Israelite, when seeking to be numbered among the congregation of the Lord, brought his piece of atonement money: we, on the other hand, should have to produce the evidence of some practical victory over sin.

The following propositions will show how vital and how numerous the differences are between the statements of Evolutionary Philosophy, as taught by Mr. Drummond, and those of Holy Scripture. We who believe in the veracity and in the *sole* authority of God's Word, maintain:

I. That the Universe did not come into existence by *Evolution* but by *Creation.*

II. That the things seen (*τα βλεπομενα*) did not come into being, out of things previously existent (*εκ των φαινομενων*). (See Hebrews xi.)

III. That Evolution is a figment; that its pretended facts are no facts at all but deceiving falsehoods.

IV. That to imagine that Evolution is only another name for Redemption (the one belonging to Science, the other to Christianity) is a dangerous delusion, inasmuch as the statements of Evc-

Digitized by Google

lution are not only opposed to, but subversive of those of Redemption.

V. That God did create all things in the manner and at the time and during the period which He has, in Genesis and elsewhere, defined.

VI. That to say that "matter is uncreatable and indestructible" is to deny the omnipotence of God and to impugn His truthfulness.

VII. That to say that we have "Truth in Nature as it came from God," is to deny the fact and the consequences of "the Fall."

VIII. That Science has no title, or ability, either to "purify Theology," or "to define the contents and limits of belief."

IX. That the fact that the theology of man is in "a state of flux," proves nothing respecting the Theology of God, which is in the Bible, and is not in "a state of flux," but of unchanged stability.

X. That Science, under pretence of purifying Theology, has mutilated, changed, and effaced the doctrines of the Bible.

XI. That Evolutionary Science, as taught in Mr. Drummond's book, denies the eternal *existence* of

Digitized by Google

the human soul, and supposes it to perish with the body.

XII. That it denies the resurrection of the body in the case, both of the just and the unjust.

XIII. That it denies the eternity of torment.

XIV. That apparently it ignores the agency of Satan, and praises writers who deny his existence.

XV. That it describes the condition of man under Natural Law (if not impeded by himself) as being one of sure progress unto Life.

XVI. That, consequently, it hides the awful fact that the natural relation of man to God is one of *wrath*, and that, consequently, all advance under Natural Law, is an advance towards judgment and the second death.

XVII. That it regards reconciliation with God to depend, not on the vicarious merit provided in the sacrificial death of Christ, but on our reception of, and voluntary submission to, an action of Life operating on us from above.

XVIII. That thus the great truth of forensic justification, as taught by the Reformers from the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, is set aside.

Digitized by Google

XIX. That the necessity of Divine wrath being met by the saved in the Person of their Substitute is ignored.

XX. That the fatal error has been committed of seeking the protoplasm or basis of the New Creation, not in that circle in which the Second Man stood as the new thing in the earth, but in the vitiated circle of corruption which surrounded the First Man who sinned.

XXI. That the Bible tells us that the natural world is distinct from the Spiritual. It also tells us that they are SO distinct that "*the taught words* of human wisdom" are not to be used as the medium of conveying spiritual truths. Mr. Drummond, on the contrary, teaches, that the words which Evolutionary Science supplies are those best suited to convey spiritual truths. Consequently, the difference betweeh the two worlds cannot be estimated by Mr. Drummond in the manner and to the extent in which the Scripture bids us estimate them.

XXII. That the same law of evolutionary progress that operates in this world on those who submit thereunto, is falsely supposed to continue to operate after death, and thus, that sabbatic fixity of condition which pertains to all who rise in the likeness of their Lord, is set aside.

Digitized by Google

XXIII. That continuance of blessedness in the case of those who are brought into the unseen world is made to depend on the continuance of their voluntary submission to the elevating power that is supposed to continue to operate on them —the end, apparently, being a virtual absorption into God.

XXIV. That the statements of Mr. Drummond respecting the effects of civilization, and the condition of the world, as being "about as good a world as might be," altogether nullify all that God has said through "His servants the Prophets" from Enoch, "the seventh from Adam," to John in Patmos, and set aside all that the Scripture declares respecting the coming manifestation of our God and Saviour in the glory of His Kingdom, and the results of such manifestation.

XXV. That even if it were as true as it is false, that vegetables stoop down from their higher sphere to raise up minerals from their lower *status*, the illustration, as respects the Divine action towards man, is a deceiving one. In the mineral there is no resistance to the supposed higher operating power. It has no enmity against the vegetable. But in man, in his relation to God, there is enmity and antagonism—an enmity that necessarily entails *wrath*. Hence the necessity of *judicial death*. Life, simply as Life, cannot meet man except to consume. It was necessary that

Digitized by Google

the Living One (ὁ ζων) should become dead (νεκρος εγενομην) in order to save. The mere acknowledgment that life from above is needed by man, is one that even Pagan Philosophers have rendered. The real questions are, How, and under what conditions, did Christ become the Life-Giver? How and under what Law does the Life provided in Him operate? What is the condition of those on whom it operates when it first reaches them; and what are the consequences in time and in eternity that result from its operation? These are the questions that concern us. The replies of Mr. Drummond and those of Scripture will be found to be at utter variance.

XXVI. That when Mr. Drummond suggests that the Spiritual Kingdom "may be the preparation for, and the prophecy of something still higher" (p. 399), such a thought is entirely at variance with the fact that the redeemed are "filled to the full" (πεπληρωμενοι, Col. ii. 10) in Him in whom "it has pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell": and again that they are Christ's "body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." (Eph. i. 23.) Every thing that is written in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians respecting the union of the Redeemed with their risen and glorified Head, is negatived by the supposition that there may be yet a more advanced condition of exaltation or blessedness.

Digitized by Google

Much more might be added, but if that which has been said does not convince, it would be useless to enlarge. Between Mr. Drummond's statements and the Bible, there is an antagonism deep and deadly, that no modifications can lessen —no explanations remove. That the character of this antagonism should not have been *instantly* recognised by all who profess to receive Evangelical Truth, is, in my judgment, a sign of the times more terrifying than any that has yet appeared. It seems to indicate that the ενεργεια πλανης (see 2 Thess. ii. 11) has penetrated into a circle from which we had hoped that it would have been (in its potency at any rate) mercifully excluded, and to show that a "withdrawal" is taking place in a sphere where we had hoped that "withdrawal" would not have been. We have all need "to search and prove our ways," and to remember that "our God is a consuming fire."

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

A.

WHEN we read of the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages devoting themselves to enquiries about the nature of spiritual existences, and determining, or seeking to determine, how many angels could at the same moment stand on the point of a needle, we marvel at their fatuity. But such fatuity, though sinful (for precious time is not to be wasted in folly), has not the guilt of defying and contradicting the Word of God. Is there less fatuity in asserting that man came into existence by evolution from gases, mire, tadpoles, and frogs? It is not only fatuity: it is a fatuity whose guilt is immeasurable; for every evolutionary system (whether modified or not) tramples under foot the testimonies of God. To accept, therefore, or to approve the writings of any who are the victims of such delusion, is a sin of the deepest dye. Moreover, even if a complete gradation of organisms could be shown to exist, there would be in that no proof that those organisms generated or evolved one another. There

Digitized by Google

would not be a shred of evidence to prove evolution, or to militate against the declarations of God in respect of those things which His almighty fiat "created and made." Even if it were true that an unbroken continuity of organisms existed, it would prove nothing as respects evolution.

It is, however, not true that such a continuity exists. The system of evolution is as contrary to fact as it is to reason and to Scripture. The theories of Evolutionists, in order to preserve even the appearance of plausibility or consistency, require that they should be able to demonstrate two things: first, that Life can be spontaneously developed; secondly, that an unbroken chain of developed organisms can be shown to exist. But they can prove neither. Spontaneous production of Life is unknown (this Mr. Drummond unhesitatingly acknowledges), and their chain of succession is broken in the disjunction of apes and men.

"We are rather anxious," says Dr. Sinclair Paterson, "to make our readers acquainted with two statements made by Professor Virchow at the Edinburgh meeting, in elucidation of the position he assumed at Munich seven years before. These statements referred to the origin of life and the descent of man. Each of them is concise and clear. He maintains, unhesitatingly, that *from life alone* can life arise, and that there is *no evidence whatever* of a link between apes and men. The importance of such testimony against the popular

Digitized by Google

doctrine of evolution cannot be overrated. Until it is proved that life can originate *spontaneously* there is an impassable chasm between the lifeless and the living. Evolution demands that there be a bridge between them, and is helpless until it is found. The non-possibility of evolving life from dead matter hopelessly bars the way. In like manner there must, if evolution be true, exist somewhere a link between the ape and man. From the ape to the man is an impossible step. There must have been one, if not many gradations. This has yet to be found, and there is no promise of its discovery. Until it be found evolution must be content to remain at best an unproved hypothesis. Professor Virchow's words are so weighty that we prefer to give them in two separate paragraphs, with appropriate headings."

ORIGIN OF LIFE.

DOES life arise from a peculiar arrangement of inorganic atoms under certain conditions? We can imagine oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen coming together to form albumen, and that out of the albumen there was produced a living cell. All this is possible; but the highest possibility is only a speculation, and cannot be admitted as the basis of a doctrine. In science it is not speculation that decides, but facts: we arrive at truth only by investigation and experiment. I need not

Digitized by Google

say that this demand of science for proof, instead of speculation, was long ago made in England. Ever since the time of Bacon it has had a home amongst you. We may concede that *generatio equivoca* is a logical possibility. But it is important for you students always to bear in mind the great distinction between the construction of logical possibilities and their application in practical life. If you try to shape your conduct simply according to logical possibilities, you will often find yourselves coming into violent conflict with the stern facts of existence. Let me give you an illustration. In recent times the fact of the presence of minute organisms giving rise to important processes has been recognised, not only in medicine, but in connection with agriculture, and various industries. It was of the utmost importance to determine whether these organisms were originated *de novo* in decomposing bodies, or were produced by similar pre-existing organisms, and introduced from without. Ten years ago it was possible to admit the spontaneous generation of microbia.* But here sits M. Pasteur, the man who has demonstrated by means of direct experiment that, in spite of all logical possibility, all known microbia found in decaying matter are descendants from similar ancestors. No man would now be justified in practical life in acting on the possibility

* Minute organisms, only visible under the microscope.

Digitized by Google

of a *generatio equivoca* of microbia. A physician who finds himself in presence of infectious disease among his patients, or an agriculturist whose crops are blighted, or a man engaged in the production of alcohol or sugar by fermentation, must set himself to discover what brings about the changes that he has to deal with; he must see that organisms are there which have been imported from without, and must then inquire whence they have been derived. The physician who has to combat an epidemic dare not act as if the germ were spontaneously produced in any patient. Such is the difference between logical possibilities and the practical work of daily life. Every teacher of science must lead his students to suppose that every living being that he meets must have had a father and mother, or at least one or other of them; and every scientific conclusion maintains that one generation is legitimately descended from another precisely similar. That was one consideration that led me to warn my fellow-countrymen against developing a system out of logical possibilities. At the very time when we were getting free from the chains of former dogmas, we seemed to be in danger of forging new ones for ourselves.

ORIGIN OF MAN.

The second question concerning Darwinism had regard to the descent of man, whether from apes or from any other vertebrate animal. Was there

Digitized by Google

anywhere a pro-anthropos. In regard to this question, I thought that the existence of such a precursor of man was a logical possibility, perhaps a probability. Only I found, to begin with, that it was a purely speculative question—not one raised by any observed phenomenon. No pro-anthropos had ever been discovered, not even a fragment of him. I had myself long been specially occupied in making prehistoric investigations to get near the primitive man. When I began these studies, twenty years ago, there was a general disposition to arrive at this discovery. Everybody who found a skull in a cave, or a bone in the fissure of a rock, thought he had got a bit of him. I wish you specially to notice that the smaller the fragment of skull, the easier it was to make it out to be the skull of the pro-anthropos. It was never thought of where the entire skull was in hand.

If you procure a series of diagrams of skulls, placing them over each other, you may make them appear similar or dissimilar, according as you choose one or another fixed point for bringing them into relation. I should like to impress upon you that every discovery of that kind should be received with caution and scrutiny. In my judgment, no skull hitherto discovered can be regarded as that of a predecessor of man. In the course of the last fifteen years we have had opportunity to examine skulls of all the various races of man-

Digitized by Google

kind—even of the most savage tribes—and among them all no group has been observed differing in its essential characters from the general human type. So that I must say that an anthropological teacher has no occasion to speak of a pro-anthropos except as a matter of speculation. But speculation in general is unprofitable. As Goethe says:—

"Ein Kerl der speculirt
Ist wie ein Thier auf oeder Heide,
Vom boesen Geist umhergeführt."*

These statements were made in April last by Professor Virchow at a great gathering of scholars, philosophers, and men of science at the Tercentenary of the University of Edinburgh. They may be regarded as decisive of the points in question. His testimony is valuable. I greatly regret, however, that he should have spoken of the existence of a pre-Adamic man as a *possibility*. It is not a possibility; that is to say, if the Scripture be true; for the Scripture expressly says, "*First* Adam"—"*First* Man." That word "*First*" settles the question. Even to seem to admit the *possibility* of any thing that God has pronounced to be impossible, or to search after any thing of which He has said that it IS NOT, is an act of rebel-

---

*A speculating fellow is like a beast on a barren heath, led about by an evil spirit.

Digitized by Google

lion against Him. When a limit to human investigation is raised by any distinct declaration that God has made, it must be sin to pass the boundary.

The following weighty words of Dr. Sinclair Paterson should be treasured in our remembrance :—

"We hear daily, and almost without surprise, of a growing unsoundness in the faith among Christian brethren, of whose adherence to Scripture we had not hitherto entertained a doubt. The air is as full of false doctrine as the atmosphere is of organic germs. When these germs find their way into bodies prepared to welcome them, they speedily give rise to disease. So when these false doctrines find minds already disposed to receive them, their progress is no less rapid than destructive."

"The whole history of the matter may be given in a single sentence. *At first the scholar acquired the art of accommodating Scripture to* SCIENCE; *now he is acquiring easily the additional art of accommodating Scripture to* SENTIMENT; *and it will not be difficult to proceed further and gain the fatal art of accommodating Scripture altogether to* SELF."

These words are too true. There is, even among Evangelical Christians, a disposition to "reply against God" when certain statements are repugnant to their sentiments or to their tendencies.

Digitized by Google

This is the more ominous when we remember that the concluding hours of this Dispensation are to be hours of special "temptation" and "delusion." We read of an hour of temptation coming to try them that dwell upon the earth, and we are also told that Satan will be permitted to bring in signs and lying wonders, and that God Himself will judicially "send on men strong delusion that they should believe a lie." Any one too who has watched the growth and spread of Spiritualism, will recognise in it a present agency that will (if God permit it to continue) work a vast change in human things. Lying spirits can in many ways address not only the hearts and ears, but also the eyes of men. What was permitted to be done in the time of Pharaoh by Jannes and Jambres may be done again; so that the same power that caused blood and frogs to meet the eyes of the Egyptians may be permitted similarly to operate now, and to work deceiving wonders. If an organic link between apes and men, or if examples of Life apparently spontaneously originated, or if specimens of pre-Adamic skulls be sought after in order to sustain a system that is avowedly in antagonism to Scripture and God, it is not at all unlikely that such examples may be permitted to appear. There is such a thing as judicial blindness. "Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears,

Digitized by Google

and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed." (Is. vi. 10.)

Never was close adherence to the Scripture, never was the close and constant care of the Great Shepherd, more needed than at the present moment. Anyone who now accepts as his guide that which Philosophy and Science present to his *Reason* or *Sight*, instead of that which God in the Scripture presents to his *Faith*, may expect DESTRUCTION.

Digitized by Google

B.

*The following extract is from a pamphlet referred to in the preceding pages. I would ask those who are interested in these subjects to obtain that pamphlet and to read it throughout.**

"Geologists in affirming that this earth was created before the time at which God says it was created, ground their assumption in part, on the discovery of certain phenomena which they say prove that the earth once existed in a very different condition from that in which we now behold it; and that it is very evident that some great act of destruction either universal, or well nigh universal, has spread ruin over it; and then come their various theories to account for the appearances they have discovered. But what weight can any one of these theories have with us, when once we discover that one of the points most material in the consideration of such a question is omitted altogether? This *adamic* earth—the earth whose creation is described in the

* Remarks on "Mosaic Cosmogony," being the fifth of "Essays and Reviews," by Benjamin Wills Newton. Houlston and Son, Paternoster Square, London."

Digitized by Google

first of Genesis, came into existence in a condition utterly different, *circumstantially*, from that in which we now behold it. Have Geologists ever thought of defining, or are they able to define with accuracy the condition of the paradisiacal earth? Have they ever thought of contrasting with the condition of this fallen earth as we now know it, its unfallen paradisiacal form when it first came fair, perfect, and blessed, from the hand of its Creator? Never. I never heard of one geological writer that has even endeavoured to say in what respects the present condition of this earth contrasts with its pristine condition of perfectness. They have evidently never reflected on the subject—it has had no place in their thoughts. In all their discussions they have overlooked the all-important fact that this earth has had, not one unchanged *condition*, but two contrasted *conditions* of existence since its Creator brought it into being in the six literal days described in Genesis. It is the same earth, indeed, but circumstantially how changed! Any theory, therefore, that pretends to account for the earth's present physical condition, if it ignore the greatness of that change which took place at the Fall (and all present geological theories do) must be utterly worthless. It cannot even have the semblance of plausibility to a reflective mind. The great and all-important period of change in the whole fabric of creation at the time when man fell, and sin and death entered, and when God,

Digitized by Google

as the Scripture tells us, subjected all creation to the bondage of corruption—that period and its resulting consequences, they utterly ignore.

The Scripture tells us that "by one offence"—the one transgression of Adam—death entered and reigned. (See Rom. v. 12 and 17.) To this statement I strictly adhere. The Scriptures do not limit the reign of death and of corruption to man, and facts prove that it is not limited to man. Am I to be told that the God of life and goodness created this earth with one thing in it that was marked by ruin or death? How in that case could He have pronounced it "very good"—how could He have rejoiced in and rested in it? It would not have been very good: He could not have rested in it. We know that at present "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together:" but it was not created in this travail. A judicial act of God in consequence of the first man's sin, has subjected it to the bondage of corruption; from which, however, through the Second Man, it will, by and by, be delivered. What I maintain, then, is, that up to the period of Adam's sin, all in creation was positively perfect. I maintain that up to that time, no death, no decay, or dissolution, no process involving destruction of life—no effects or consequences of destructive judgment, existed either amongst animals or men. Nothing that spoke of ruin was presented to the eye or to the thought of angel or of man, for no such thing existed.

Digitized by Google

Not only the surface of the earth, but the earth's lowest parts down to its inmost centre were marked, not by traces of convulsion, distortion, and fiery dissolution, but by the presence of absolute perfectness—bearing witness to the life-giving and sustaining power of God. But when man sinned, and when with him creation fell, all was changed. He whose almighty fiat had called light into being, appointed now by a like act of almighty power that death should penetrate and reign over all things. Inward fires that before had never operated to destroy, were now caused to rage destructively within the earth's bowels. The fact that they do there rage destructively, even philosophy admits, and every volcano proves.* Does any one believe that these raging fires burnt within the earth's bowels at first, or that the traces of their agency as seen in fused mountains thrown up upon the earth's surface,† were found mark-

---

* "Let us take the extreme estimate of forty miles as the depth below which the matter composing the earth is completely liquefied [by fire]. This depth is the one-hundredth part of the terrestial radius. We are then to regard the earth as a spherical shell of solid matter filled with liquid fire. . . . . If the egg of a fowl or an ostrich be imagined to represent the earth, its shell would be much too thick to represent the earth's solid crust!" (Earthquakes and Volcanoes, Lardner's Popular Geology, § 8.)

† "The central fluid [fiery] matter pressing unequally on its confining shell, has at various times cracked it in dif-

Digitized by Google

ing upon the earth the stamp of judgment, when first it existed in its pristine paradisiacal perfectness? Is it not a fact, plainly attested by Scripture, that Sheohl or Hades (in the lowest division of which, called in Scripture "the lowest Hades," the departed souls of the wicked are at present confined) is formed within the earth's bowels?* Surely no such place, indicative of the triumph of sin and death, could have existed when all throughout the whole creation was good, perfect and blessed. No place of anguish—no *penal* prison-house, nor indeed any prison-house can be supposed to have existed in the bowels of the earth then. But this globe, once appointed to be

---

ferent directions, and the molten mineral matter, issuing from the fissures, and gradually cooling, ... has formed mountain chains over the fissures. Such has been the operation by which the vast ridges of the Andes, which traverse the new continent from north to south, and those of the Alps and Himalaya, which traverse the old continents from east to west, have been formed." (Ibid, § 10.)

* For further remarks on the *locality* of Hades, see note subjoined to "Remarks on Mosaic Cosmogony" as advertised at end of this pamphlet. There can be little doubt that the vast mountain chains were thrown up on the earth's surface by the action of fire, were thrown up when Hades was formed within the earth's bowels, not previous to, but after the fall. There was in Hades a part assigned to the blessed; and there the soul of our blessed Lord was during the time that His body was in the grave. It is evident that the interior of the earth was not occupied *entirely* by fire *then*.

Digitized by Google

the witness of the life-giving power of God for good, has since become a witness of His destructive power in judgment. What part of the earth's crust (for since Sheohl or Hades was formed, and internal fires began to operate destructively, the earth is but a crust) does not bear witness to the action of violent and destructive agencies, not only by contortion, dislocation, and the like, but by their very constitution? How then can we suppose that any such appearances in the earth's strata existed when first the earth came into its perfected being and was pronounced very good? A direct intervention from God (an intervention not less miraculous, and *possibly* not more prolonged, than that which first called the earth into being) smote it with the stroke of judgment—a stroke that in all probability penetrated like an electric shock to its lowest parts. At first the earth was adapted to the condition which man held in happiness and innocency; afterwards it became altered to meet the condition of man as fallen, and was subjected to the reign of death,—even the very dislocation of the earth's strata and their arrangements (the place of coal fields, metalliferous districts, and the like) being doubtless appointed with anticipative reference to the need of man as fallen, and with a certain reference too, to the destined place which each nation and each tribe should hold in human history till the great end shall come. The mere circumstance then, that all

Digitized by Google

present geologic theories ignore these truths, and give no place to the great fact of creation being subjected to the bondage of corruption and the reign of death, is in itself sufficient to invalidate their conclusions.

Digitized by Google

C.

Since the above was written, my attention has been directed to two Reviews of Mr. Drummond's work. One has appeared in a High Church Journal. From this I will extract three passages.

The Reviewer says:

"The great popularity which it has attained is due, we believe, in a very large measure to the fact that it professes to supply what is just for the moment, a very real want. The Christian world wants to be scientific; Christians would like something more than a mere *modus vivendi* with men of science. A division of territory has been tried and failed; a compromise is eminently unsatisfactory. But here is a book in which men find what they take for granted is the Christian faith, actually phrased in the language of physical science. An age with evolution on the brain is not likely to stop and ask, 'Is evolution true?' Does its most ardent scientific defender imagine that the form which the doctrine now presents is final; and if *not*, is it a wise thing for a Christian apologist to rest eternal truths on such a shifting ground? But the curious thing is that the extravagant praises which have been lavished on this book have blinded men to the fact that the Christianity which fits in so conveniently with Mr. Drummond's scientific framework is not the Christianity of the Bible or of the Catholic Church."

It is a solemn thing to live in an Age which has "Evolution on the brain." Such an Age must have set itself *against* God, and rejected the testi-

Digitized by Google

mony that He has given respecting Himself as God the Creator. Every step it takes will only involve itself in rayless darkness. Well may the Reviewer say, that the Christianity of the book we are considering is not the Christianity of the Bible.

The Reviewer further says:

"Mr. Drummond does not seem aware of all that his theory implies. For all the unregenerate it necessarily implies annihilation. For the falling out of correspondence with the rest of their environment is, for them, the end of all things. It is only fair, however, to say that Mr. Drummond guards himself against the closely connected heresy known as the 'indefectibility of grace.' The living soul can commit suicide. But be it observed the alternative possibilities of balance, degeneration, and evolution are only possibilities for 'the spiritually organic.' They are biological terms and have no meaning for 'the spiritually inorganic.' And the Agnostic and the unregenerate are only crystals."

The Reviewer rightly says that Mr. Drummond's book teaches the annihilation of the unregenerate. He also says that it teaches (and for this he praises it) that the regenerate may finally perish. Yet God says, that He gives to the regenerate ETERNAL Life, and that they "have passed from Death unto life." Thus we find that this book rejects what God has said respecting Himself—I. As the Creator; II. As to Himself as the Awarder of Judgment; III. Respecting Himself as the Awarder of Life. Is more required to indicate its character? Thus Science "recasts" Truth.

Digitized by Google

The Reviewer further says :—

"Mr. Drummond proceeds, unconsciously, to argue thus :—Given Herbert Spencer as the regenerator of science, the purifier of theology and the only really trustworthy interpreter of the Bible, how can we reconstruct our beliefs so as to keep Calvin's theory of election and conversion, and get rid of the 'venerable verbiage,' which, for eighteen centuries and more, has passed for Christian theology? The result is what we have seen, a result which is admirably described in the 'Novum Organon.' Lord Bacon was criticising those who only made the mistake of trying to find science (*philosophia naturalis*) in the Bible, 'seeking,' as he says, 'the dead among the living.' Mr. Drummond reverses the process, and seeks the living among the dead.' But the general result is the same. 'From this unwholesome mixing up of things human and divine, there arises not only a phantastic science, but also an heretical religion."

With many of the Reviewer's remarks I am at utter variance, but with his conclusions as expressed in the words of Lord Bacon just quoted, and in his conviction of the sure destruction wrought by Evolutionary theories in any of their forms, I heartily concur. "An age with evolution on the brain," is marked for ruin.

The other Review is in a Journal that has been regarded as Evangelically Protestant. On the present occasion its character is sufficiently marked by its unequivocal adoption of Mr. Drummond's Evolutionary principles. "We accept" (it says) "the general doctrine of evolution, as does also Professor Drummond." The testimony, therefore,

Digitized by Google

of Moses is rejected, and with it the Scripture. To all, therefore, who hold fast to the integrity, truthfulness, and exclusive authority of the Bible, the opinions of such a writer must be valueless. Nothing is more to be dreaded than an attempt to gild the phantasies of evolution with fragments of Christianity.

As the Reviewer accepts Mr. Drummond's fundamental principle, he regards with favour his work as a whole. The value of his approval may be judged of from the following extraordinary passage:—

"The state of the merely natural soul, not yet regenerated by the Spirit of God, may no doubt be fitly symbolised by matter which is not living; but such matter may be of crystalline purity; and though a crystal is not living, it is an abuse of words to call it dead.

"But though the relation of life to matter is a perfectly legitimate symbol of the relation of the regenerating Spirit to the natural soul of man, the analogy will not bear to be pressed far. If the natural and unconverted soul were in relation to the Spirit of God like mere inanimate matter, this would imply that the human faculties of 'reverence, love and worship, first came into existence when the gift of the Holy Spirit was sent; and further, that these powers have no existence in unspiritual men, and are created in the moment of conversion. But all this would be so contrary to the most obvious fact, that any theory which assumes its truth must be wrong; and, moreover, the language of Christ and His prophets and apostles assumes the contrary—that the powers of spiritual knowledge, discernment, and love, are present in man, and waiting to be rightly directed, 'The isles shall wait

Digitized by Google

for [the revelation of] His law,' said Isaiah; Christ said, in the very act of revealing Himself to Saul the persecutor, 'It is hard for thee to kick against the goad' of conscience; and after the persecutor had become an Apostle, he said to the idolaters of Athens, 'The unknown God, whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you.' These are but a few instances, and perhaps not the most striking that could be found, of the practice of the prophets and apostles to appeal to the natural reason, the natural conscience, and the natural heart—an appeal which would be without meaning if the natural man were, in relation to the Spirit of God, like mere lifeless matter.' But Professor Drummond's theory ignores all this."

No doubt Mr. Drummond has greatly erred in likening the condition of natural man when operated on from above, to the mineral, or any other form of lifeless matter. In the first place, man is "dead" in the sense of having died out of a previous condition of life. This is not true of the mineral. We cannot speak of lifeless matter being *re*generated. Secondly, though man is dead towards God, he is nevertheless instinct with living powers of enmity against Him. Fallen man is, spiritually, lifeless, but he is not, naturally, lifeless. The mineral is lifeless. It has no moral tendencies; no moral responsibilities. In every way, therefore, Mr. Drummond's analogy fails, as is sufficiently shown by his own description of natural man as one in which "the soul longs and yearns, wastes and pines, waving its tentacles piteously in the empty air, feeling after God" (p. 300). No

Digitized by Google

condition of the lifeless mineral can consort with an activity like this.

Mr. Drummond's analogy, no doubt, fails, and its failure fatally invalidates his argument respecting Natural Law and the like: yet, there is little divergence between his views and those of the Reviewer as respects the condition of natural man. Substantially, their views accord, though Mr. Drummond has scarcely ventured to say what the Reviewer says, that "the state of the merely natural soul, not yet regenerated by the Spirit of God, may, no doubt, be fitly symbolised by matter that is not living; *but such matter may be of crystalline purity**!! Nor is Mr. Drummond wont to fortify his arguments by citations from Scripture so utterly devoid of pertinence and plausibility as those employed by the Reviewer. Man's natural heart is certainly very unlike the condition in which the repentant "isles" will be when, humbled like Paul, by the manifested glory of the Lord, they shall meekly say, "Lord Jesus, what wilt thou have us to do"? Nor was that which Paul was warned not to kick against, the goad of his own conscience, but rather the goad of almighty power wielded by the hand of Christ: nor was the condition of the cultivated but idolatrous Gentiles, who were working all "uncleanness with greediness," a condition that could be described

* The italics are mine.

Digitized by Google

as one in which "*the powers of spiritual knowledge, discernment, and love, were present,*" "*waiting to be rightly directed.*"

But I shall say no more. Nothing can be more appalling than the prospect before us. Unquestionably the haughty abandonment of Genesis is regarded by God as an abandonment of Himself, and (except there be speedy repentance) He will send judicial blindness, and the time of the threatened delusion will set in. The effect of Mr. Drummond's book will not, I believe, be the establishment of his own peculiar system, which will be found deficient in coherency. It will probably lead to some of those forms of Pantheism which prevailed in the earlier Alexandrian Schools, and have been adopted by Maurice and others, among ourselves. But whatever the form or forms of "withdrawal" may be, the awful fact remains, that the guidance of the Bible is being renounced, and other guidance deliberately chosen.

Digitized by Google

D.

Luther on Perfection.

"He (Latomus) blames me for maintaining that no human action can endure the severity of God's judgment. I reply, he ought to shudder in undertaking to defend the opposite sentiment. Suppose for a moment, that any man could say, that he has indeed fulfilled the precept of God in some one good work. Then such a man might fairly address the Almighty to this effect: 'Behold, O Lord, by the help of thy grace, I have done this good work. There is in it no sin; no defect; it needs not thy pardoning mercy; which, therefore, in this instance I do not ask. I desire that thou wouldst judge this action strictly and impartially. I feel assured, that as thou art just and faithful, thou canst not condemn it; and, therefore, I glory in it before thee. Our Saviour's prayer teaches me to implore the forgiveness of my trespasses: but in regard to this work, mercy is not necessary for the remission of sin, but rather justice for the reward of merit.' To such indecent, unchristian conclusions are we naturally led by the pride of the scholastic system. To conclude. This doctrine of the sinless perfection of

Digitized by Google

human works, finds no support in Scripture: it rests entirely on a few expressions of the fathers, who are yet by no means agreed among themselves; and if they were agreed, still their authority is only human."

LUTHER, AS QUOTED BY MILNER,
Vol. V., Chapter vii.

Digitized by Google

E.

"*There be many that say, Who will show us any good.*" (Psalm iv. 6).

At an hour of extended profession like the present, when the light of the Bible has so far touched the consciences of multitudes as to cause them to feel dissatisfied, restless, and unhappy, such words as are found in the prefixed text are doubtless the utterance of many a heart. On all, therefore, who fear God and cleave to His Word, a solemn responsibility rests—that they do nothing to obscure the light of Christ's Truth, or to throw stumbling-blocks in the way of those who might (if led rightly on) be brought to see "the plague of their own hearts" and to seek "the fountain opened for sin and all uncleanness" "in the blood of the Lamb."

No one can read the words I am about to quote from the writings of the late Lord Beaconsfield, without seeing that he must have had (when he wrote them) a deep and vivid impression of the moral ruin around us. He brings the hero of his tale to Sinai, and puts into his mouth the following prayer:—

"O Lord God of Israel, Creator of the Universe, ineffable Jehovah! I, a child of Christendom, come to thine ancient Arabian altars to pour forth the heart of tortured Europe.

Digitized by Google

Why art thou silent? Why no longer do the messages of thy renovating will descend on earth? Faith fades and duty dies. A profound melancholy has fallen on the spirit of man. The priest doubts, the monarch cannot rule, the multitude moans and toils, and calls in its frenzy upon unknown gods. If this transfigured mount may not again behold Thee; if not again, upon thy sacred Syrian plains, Divinity may teach and solace men; if prophets may not rise again to herald hope; at least, of all the starry messengers that guard Thy throne, let one appear, to save thy creatures from a terrible despair!"

As regards the presence of a deepening darkness, these words present too true a picture of Christendom and of the world. Lord Beaconsfield, indeed, did not discern where, and what the visitations of light have been, that have, from time to time, prevented totality of gloom. He did not understand the force of those words—"The Word of God is living." He did not recognise, how, through the presence of the Scripture, the voice of the living God, clear and mighty, continues to sound amidst the roar of evil. He did not apprehend what is written in the Scripture of Truth respecting the return of the great Head of Israel in glory, nor understand the difference between the voice that spake from Sinai, and that which now speaks in grace from Zion. Yet he did clearly discern that neither Sacerdotal Ecclesiasticism, nor worldly Religiousness, nor Philosophic Speculativeness, have wrought deliverance. "Faith fades, and duty dies."

Digitized by Google

His judgment of Evolutionary Philosophy may be seen from the following extract.

The hero of his tale, "Tancred," is conversing with a lady, who, taking up a book that was at hand, said:

"Do you know this?"

"And Tancred, opening a volume which he had never seen, and then turning to its title-page, found it was 'The Revelations of Chaos,' a startling work just published, and of which a rumour had reached him.

"'No,' he replied; 'I have not seen it.'

"'I will lend it you if you like: it is one of those books one must read. It explains everything, and is written in a very agreeable style.'

"'It explains everything!' said Tancred; 'it must, indeed, be a very remarkable book.'

"'I think it will just suit you,' said Lady Constance. 'Do you know, I thought so several times while I was reading it.'

"'To judge from the title, the subject is rather obscure,' said Tancred.

"'No longer so,' said Lady Constance. 'It is treated scientifically; everything is explained by geology and astronomy, and in that way. It shows you exactly how a star is formed; nothing can be so pretty! A cluster of vapour, the cream of the milky way, a sort of celestial cheese, churned into light, you must read it, 'tis charming.'

"'Nobody ever saw a star formed,' said Tancred.

"'Perhaps not. You must read the 'Revelations;' it is all explained. But what is most interesting, is the way in which man has been developed. You know, all is development. The principle is perpetually going on. First, there was nothing, then there was something; then, I forget the

Digitized by Google

next, I think there were shells, then fishes; then we came, let me see, did we come next? Never mind that; we came at last. And the next change there will be something very superior to us, something with wings. Ah! that's it: we were fishes, and I believe we shall be crows. But you must read it.'

"'I do not believe I ever was a fish,' said Tancred

"'Oh! but it is all proved! you must not argue on my rapid sketch; read the book. It is impossible to contradict anything in it. You understand, it is all science; it is not like those books in which one says one thing and another the contrary, and both may be wrong. Everything is proved: by geology you know. You see exactly how everything is made; how many worlds there have been; how long they lasted; what went before, what comes next. We are a link in the chain, as inferior animals were that preceded us: we in turn shall be inferior; all that will remain of us will be some relics in a new red sandstone. This is development. We had fins; we may have wings.'

"Tancred grew silent and thoughtful; Lady Brancepeth moved, and he rose at the same time. Lady Charmouth looked as if it were by no means necessary for him to depart, but he bowed very low, and then bade farewell to Lady Constance, who said, 'We shall meet to-night.'

"'I was a fish, and I shall be a crow, said Tancred to himself, when the hall door closed on him. 'What a spiritual mistress!'"

This is a tale; but has it no moral? There are still hearts thoughtful, intelligent and penetrating, like that of Lord Beaconsfield—hearts seeking rest. What if those who profess to be the servants of Christ and to speak His words, connect themselves with books and systems that

Digitized by Google

teach things from which Nature revolts, and at which those who fear God shudder,—what must the effect be on a mind like that of Lord Beaconsfield? Shall his withering sarcasm teach us no lesson? Some will say, it is a caricature. To a certain extent, it is; but the lightness and frivolity depicted find too close parallels in many conversations of the present day. False thought has a tendency to generate light-mindedness and flippancy of expression. And further, would Lord Beaconsfield with his view of human things have listened for one moment to a voice that told him that the world is already "about as good a world as might be": and (though God, through Evolution, or otherwise, "may still have finishing touches to add here and there") yet that "already it is 'all very good'"? Which is nearest to the Truth, the picture drawn in the supposed prayer at Sinai, or the picture sketched by the Evolutionist? Shall Protestant Teachers then connect themselves with systems and doctrines which even the natural conscience of men condemns, and which Reason, Experience, and the Bible, alike reprobate?

Protestantism is now in a position of fearful danger. If it look back to the condition of professing Christianity in the third and fourth centuries, it will find a chaos of confusing thought, in the midst of which Ecclesiasticism and Philosophy strove for mastery, and which finally ended in the

Digitized by Google

ruin which has marked the course of Mahomedanism in the East, and Popery in the West. At the Reformation, there was a gracious intervention of God, whence effects of unspeakable blessedness have resulted: but the Reformation was not perfected; it was hindered in its growth, and worldliness and corruption have set in. Decaying Protestantism seems not unwilling to accept Neologianism and Evolutionary Philosophy as allies. The call to us all is loud that we should "search and prove our ways, and turn again to the Lord." "To the Law and to the Testimony." But what if instead of obeying this call we turn back to the idolatries of Ecclesiasticism, or to the lies of Evolutionary Philosophy? Should we not bring ourselves under the condemnation of these awful words, "The dog has turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire?"

I scarcely need say that in writing thus I am writing against systems, not assailing individuals. In such controversies names are algebraic symbols merely. I know, too, that there is long-suffering mercy in God, and that He can compassionate ignorance, and make allowance for perplexity and entanglement. He can also "heal backsliding." Nevertheless, He is a God of judgment: and if any should intelligently and deliberately persevere in setting the fictions of Evolutionary Philosophy against the declarations of God in Scripture,

Digitized by Google

touching the reality and the methods of His creative power, I cannot but believe that such transgression (if not repented of) must be numbered amongst those works of the flesh of which it is written, "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Heresies are expressly numbered among such deeds of the flesh. See Galatians v. 21. We must remember, too, that in speaking of the last preaching of the Everlasting Gospel in this Dispensation, the Scripture thus writes: "Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come: and worship Him that *made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.*" These words (and there are many like words) point to that denial of the creative power of God which is to be one of the great characteristic transgressions of the last days. We may be very sure that the denial of the truthfulness of God as respects the account given by Him touching the time, mode, and order of His creation, will be the sure prelude to the formal denial of Himself as the Creator.

Digitized by Google

F.

IT has been suggested by some that Mr. Drummond, in saying that "matter is uncreatable," means only that it is uncreatable by man.

To this I reply:

I. That it cannot be supposed that Mr. Drummond would have thought it worth while to affirm so emphatically a truth that no one has ever impugned. No one has ever thought of asserting that a creature could bring matter into existence out of nothing. The question ever has been, whether or not God is able to do this.

II. Seeing that it is the pronounced opinion of the leaders of scientific thought in this country that Creation is an "unphilosophic notion," Mr. Drummond would, no doubt, have felt it his duty to negative the statement if he had not accepted it. But he has not done so. On the contrary, he has affirmed in the broadest way, not only that matter has not been created, but that it is "*uncreatable*": that is, that it cannot be created.

III. In his treatise Mr. Drummond is avowedly engaged in teaching us respecting a certain Natural Law which he supposes to regulate the Divine

Digitized by Google

action, both in this world and in the next. He is not treating of the operations of man, but of God. It is in this connection, whilst treating of the Divine operation, that he says, "We should be forsaking the lines of nature were we to imagine that the new creature was to be formed out of nothing. Nothing can be made out of nothing. Matter is uncreatable," etc. He says this whilst he is avowedly speaking of the Divine operations, for surely no other than God could create "the new creature." He seeks to prove that the New Creation cannot, even by the power of God, be created out of nothing, on the broad ground that "nothing can be created out of nothing." By the argument this must apply to God, for it is His agency that is the subject of the passage.

IV. Mr. Drummond is avowedly an Evolutionist. It is impossible to be an Evolutionist and to believe that matter was created in the sense of being called into existence out of nothing. "Evolution" is a word which by the force of its own intrinsic meaning nullifies Creation.

V. Mr. Drummond and other Evolutionary teachers may occasionally use the word "create," and apply it to God: but they evidently use it in their own evolutionary sense. They are not unwilling to admit that God caused evolutionary agencies to order, form, and control matter; but

Digitized by Google

they will not admit that God called matter into existence out of nothing, nor will they accredit the narrative that God has given in Genesis of the *formation* of matter when it had been called into existence.

VI. If Mr. Drummond has been misunderstood, he can easily remove the misunderstanding. If he will admit that God did call matter into existence out of nothing, and will also admit that matter was not eternally existent in God, he will effectually clear himself from the present charge: but he would at the same moment cease to be an Evolutionist; and this would involve the necessity of his book being re-written.

It may be right to state that, whilst the words "matter is uncreatable," would be, by most persons understood as meaning that it was self-existent and eternal, there is another sense in which these words may be interpreted. There are some who maintain that the Universe of matter now seen, was from the beginning hidden in God. They say, that as electricity and invisible moisture are in the air, so the unseen universe of matter was in God and thence evolved. This was the kind of doctrine held in various forms and various modifications, by semi-Pagan, semi-Jewish, semi-Christian Schools of Alexandria, in the early centuries; and

Digitized by Google

it has been revived in Western Europe by the Neologians of Germany and England. Whether Mr. Drummond may explain the statement that matter is "uncreatable" by saying, that it eternally existed in God; or whether he would maintain that it had from eternity an independent existence, I do not know. The first conjecture would seem to be more in harmony with his general system as also with some of his expressions, for he hints (p. 53) at an unseen universe "existing before the seen"; and he also says, "Why will men treat God as inorganic?" (P. 297.) If this ground be taken, it would avail nothing as regards approximation to the Bible. The Bible declares that "God is a Spirit;" consequently, that which we term "matter" could have no existence *in* Him. Secondly, the Scripture in Genesis says, that "matter" was created. This system says that it *was not* created, but that it eternally existed in God. Antagonism, therefore, to the Scripture, is not by such a system either removed or lessened.

One School of Pantheists (and not a small one) are fond of quoting, or rather misquoting, Col. i. 16. Altering the proper translation of the preposition ἐν, (used in the sense of the Hebrew ב as denoting instrumental agency), they read, "*In* Him [the Son] were all things created"; and then, in order to escape the charge of Arianism and of materializing the nature of the Son, they resort to the usual device of explain-

Digitized by Google

ing away the force of κτιζω, to create, just as in Genesis they explain away the force of בָּרָא. We must not be misled, therefore, by Neologian uses of the word "create," but must require its definition. Do you or do you not believe that God called the seen universe into existence out of non-existence, so that the things seen were "NOT made of things that do appear"? In Colossians it is expressly declared that the Eternal Son was "the First-born before all creation." (πρωτοτοκως πασης κτισεως. Compare use of πρωτος in John i. 30.) It is also said that "He WAS before all things." In other words, He was the I AM before the existence of any created thing. If He was "*before* all things," it is very evident that all things could not have been created *in* Him.*

Mr. Drummond uses the word "create" in page 140, but the illustration by which it is accompanied would lead us to suppose that he does not use it in its strict sense. The illustration (viz., "*giving*" the wind to a mariner who has prepared his sail to catch it) directs our mind to a supernatural direction of an existing energy, but not to

* For further remarks on this subject see Chapter v., p. 48, in "Remarks on the Revised English Version of the Greek New Testament" as advertised at the end of this pamphlet. The chapter is entitled "Danger of asserting that all things were created in eternity in Christ." I particularly request that that chapter should be read.

Digitized by Google

the originisation of that energy at the time when it was first called into being. In referring to the Universe, too, he speaks of it as being composed of "manufactured articles."

There is like confusion of thought or of expression when he speaks of "Nature" and "God." In page 131, speaking of the growth of a flower, he says, "*It is Nature, it is God*"—here associating what he terms "Nature," and God. But in page 297 he associates Nature, not with God, but with man, for he says "Matter is uncreatable and indestructible. *Nature and man can only form and transform.*" If "Nature" be here understood in the sense in which he uses it on page 131, it would be a distinct assertion that God forms, but does not "create."

CORRIGENDA.

P. 93, *for* ψενδοις *read* ψενδος.
P. 101, *for* εζουσια *read* εξουσια.

WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO., Printers, Circus Place, London Wall.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google